

Department of State

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

bulletin

Vol. XVII, No. 493

October 12, 1948

REPORT OF ESTABLISH COMMITTEE TO STUDY
THE PROBLEM OF THE ARAB BOYCOTT 719

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE
PROBLEM OF THE ARAB BOYCOTT 720

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE
PROBLEM OF THE ARAB BOYCOTT 721





The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XIX, No. 493 • PUBLICATION 3365

December 12, 1948

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication compiled and edited in the Division of Publications, Office of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$5, foreign \$7.25
Single copy, 15 cents

Published with the approval of the
Director of the Bureau of the Budget

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

Proposal To Establish Committee To Study Berlin Currency Problem

TEXT OF PROPOSAL OF PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

[Released to the press December 21]

The President of the Security Council, in the exercise of his powers, has decided:

(1) To invite the Governments of Belgium, Canada, China, Colombia, and Syria, each to nominate a financial or economic expert, who, together with an expert nominated by the Government of Argentina, shall meet in Paris, and whose task shall be to consider and make recommendation to the President of the Security Council upon the most equitable conditions, taking into account the directive of August 30, 1948, as well as information concerning events subsequent thereto, for the agreement among the occupying powers relating to introduction, circulation and continued use of a single currency for Berlin under adequate four-power supervision and import and export regulations in connection with outside trade of Berlin.

(2) To invite the Secretary General to nominate a financial or economic expert to work with the committee mentioned in paragraph one above; and to cooperate fully with the committee and supply in addition all information and all the facilities and staff that the said committee may require.

(3) The committee is fully empowered to consult with the economic or financial experts representing each of the four occupying powers in Berlin, and also, if they deem it convenient, with other economic or financial experts.

(4) This study must be definitely finished within thirty days as from the date of this resolution. How must the experts carry out its task?

The Commission will fix its plan of work and immediately after will get in contact with the

representatives, specialists in economy assigned by the governments of the United States, Great Britain, France and the U.S.S.R. in order to end their task within the period established in paragraph four of the resolution.

Which items will the technicians cover in their studies?

The technicians appointed, acting jointly in all circumstances, will try to arrange with the parties in conflict the adequate terms to enforce the directives of August 30, 1948, in the matter related with the introduction in Berlin of the Soviet mark as well as the control on emission, supply and circulation of the sole currency, the adequate rules to regulate banking and credit facilities and the exterior trade of Berlin, and the consideration of other subsequent facts which could bring difficulty to the implementation of the draft agreements or recommendations.

How will the recommendations submitted to the President of the Security Council be adopted?

The recommendations submitted to the President of the Security Council will be adopted by the technicians representing the six countries appearing in paragraph one of the previous resolution, which should meet with the conformity of the technicians of the United States, Great Britain, France and the U.S.S.R.

In case of not reaching agreement among the parties the commission of technicians will submit to the President of the Security Council a detailed report of the performances carried out, the studies made, the propositions submitted, and the causes that on every one of the items prevented from reaching the corresponding agreements.

TEXT OF THREE-POWER REPLY

[Released to the press December 21]

The following communication was handed on behalf of the Governments of the United States of America, France, and the United Kingdom on November 30 to Juan Atilio Bramuglia, President of the Security Council

The Representatives of the United States of America, France and the United Kingdom wel-

come the proposal of the President of the Security Council to establish a Committee of Neutral Experts to study the Berlin currency and trade problems.

In welcoming the proposal to establish the Committee of Neutral Experts, the three representatives desire to make it clear that they must reserve entirely the position of their governments as re-

December 12, 1948

gards any resolution which may subsequently be submitted to the Security Council after the Committee have reported. They would require to consider any such resolution in the light of the Committee's report and of the general circumstances prevailing at that time.

The three western powers accepted the proposed Security Council resolution of October 25 and have reiterated their willingness to abide by its principles; the Soviet Union has rejected it. The Soviet Union during the period since October 25 has consistently and continuously resorted to further measures directed against the city administration which have brought about an increasing split in the city.

TRIPARTITE COMMUNIQUÉ TO COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS¹

In the reply recently presented by the three Western powers to the President of the Security Council's questions on the Berlin currency problem, it was pointed out that it would inevitably be difficult in practice to exercise four-power control of currency in a city in which the previous unified administration under four-power control was not fully functioning at present and was indeed being rapidly diminished. In disregard of the expressed wish of the President of the Security Council that any steps should be avoided, which would lead to a complication of the Berlin crisis, developments instigated by the Soviet command in Germany have now still further detracted from the unified character of the city administration.

On the afternoon of 30 November the Soviet authorities countenanced, and indeed encouraged a series of events in their sector, which have completed the exclusion of the legal city administration from its proper seat in the Soviet sector and from the exercise of its legal authorities in the areas of Berlin which are under Soviet occupation. A carefully stage-managed meeting of Communists and Communist front organizations (including a handful of former members from the other legal Berlin political parties) brought into being a body for which no legal basis exists, but which claims to be the provisional government for the entire City of Berlin.

Although this illegal body will be excluded from usurping any functions of the legal city government as far as the Western sectors of Berlin are concerned, its existence in the Soviet sector will

The three western powers cannot agree that they should be bound to submit to all Soviet measures which add to and intensify the Soviet blockade or which interfere with the city administration, while the Soviet remains wholly uncommitted to any restraint. The three governments therefore repeat the reservation of their right, declared to the Security Council when the Berlin question was submitted to that body "to take such measures as may be necessary to maintain in these circumstances their position in Berlin" pending the outcome of the further efforts of the President of the Security Council with which efforts France, the United Kingdom and the United States have cooperated and will continue to cooperate.

end all possibility of the legal, unified administration functioning on a city-wide basis. This is a development that the Western powers have constantly striven to avoid. It is obvious that the *de facto* political division of the city makes the establishment of a single currency extremely difficult.

The representatives of the Western powers have assured the President of the Security Council that they are anxious to provide all possible assistance in the Council's examination of the Berlin currency problem. They consider that the experts who are attempting to work out a plan for the solution of this problem must take into account the existing position in Berlin and will find it useful to be given information on the underlying political background of the existing division of the city administration. A chronology of the events which have taken place since June, 1948, leading to the present situation is therefore attached.

[This chronology lists incidents in Berlin since June 23, the details of which have been published.]

The following short historical summary will, it is hoped, enable it to be more readily understood.

The historical basis and the international agreements setting forth the rights, duties and obligations of the four occupying powers in Berlin have been fully stated in the presentation of the Berlin case to the Security Council and in the White Papers on the Berlin problem published by the United States and the United Kingdom Governments.

In order to establish a democratically elected government to succeed the administration, which had been appointed by the Soviet authorities at the time of their sole occupancy of the city, a temporary constitution under which the city government was to be returned to elected German officials was approved by the Allied Coordinating Committee on 2 August 1946 and issued by the

¹ Delivered on Dec. 5, 1948, by the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France to the Security Council's Committee of Experts on the Berlin currency problem. Released to the press in Paris on Dec. 6, 1948, and in Washington on Dec. 7, 1948. Printed from telegraphic text.

Kommandatura on 13 August 1946 to become effective in October 1946.

The four occupying powers agreed that elections for the City Assembly under the approved temporary constitution should be held in early October, 1946. In these elections the Socialist Unity party (the Soviet-sponsored Communist party) was decisively defeated, receiving only 19.5 per cent of the votes.

The Magistrat (City Council) appointed by the newly elected Assembly was charged, under the general control of the Allied Kommandatura, with the duty of governing the city, and for this purpose fourteen executive departments were formed. German City Councillors, drawn from all the parties represented in the City Assembly, but with a majority from the Social Democratic party, were appointed as heads of these departments.

The relationship of the departments of the Magistrat and of the Magistrat itself to the Allied Kommandatura was complicated. Since unanimous approval of the Allied Kommandatura was required for any major action taken by the Magistrat, the Soviet authorities by withholding their consent could and did hamper the conduct of the city's affairs.

For example, in June, 1947, they opposed the appointment by the City Assembly and the Magistrat of Herr Reuter as Mayor of Berlin. Reuter was a Social Democrat with an outstanding record as an administrator against whom no serious case was ever made by the Soviet authorities. Interference such as this had an increasingly serious effect upon the administration of the city and indeed progressively tended to split it in two.

Soviet methods were not always the same. In cases where a department head of the city government was a member of the Socialist Unity party, they took the form of encouraging him to disregard the wishes and instructions of the Magistrat, whose servant he was, and to issue orders nominally applicable to the whole city which were acceptable neither to the Magistrat nor to the Western powers but only to the Soviet authorities. In self-defense, in such cases, either the Magistrat had to suspend the head of the department for defying their orders or the Western powers had to take measures limiting the authority of the department in the Western sectors.

A typical example of such Soviet tactics is the case of Berlin's former Police President Paul Markgraf, a member of the Socialist Unity party who consistently pursued a policy contrary to the wishes of the Magistrat. The Magistrat therefore sought to dismiss him in March, 1948, subject to the approval of the Kommandatura. This was never obtained because on the very day on which this matter was to be discussed the Soviet element refused to participate any longer in its activities. The Magistrat then took the only course open to

it under the circumstances and suspended Markgraf, an act not requiring Kommandatura approval, and appointed in his stead as acting Police President, Dr. Stumm. This appointment was subsequently confirmed by the three Western commandants. The Soviet commandant in Berlin refused to recognize the suspension and demanded Dr. Stumm's dismissal.

Markgraf continued to occupy the police offices in the Soviet sector and Dr. Stumm was forced to establish his headquarters in the Western sectors of Berlin. Hence, since July, 1948, there have been two police forces operating in Berlin, the one in the Soviet sector having no legal basis whatever and able to operate there only because of the support of the Soviet authorities.

In other cases where the head of the department concerned was a member of one of the non-Communist parties, intervention by the Soviet authorities was even more direct. In such cases, the Soviet military administration, assuming a power which it did not have, took unilateral action and either dismissed the official concerned (an illegal action whose practical effect was to remove the Soviet sector from his jurisdiction) or set up a rival office within his department whose authority was exclusively recognized in the Soviet sector. In addition, the Soviet authorities in some cases went so far as to arrest non-Communist German officials.

For example, in August, 1948, the Soviet Military Administration unilaterally ordered the dismissal of the director of the Central Coal Organization of the Magistrat's Department of Economy. The Magistrat refused to recognize this Soviet order, pointing out that such orders were only valid if approved and duly transmitted by the four-power Kommandatura. The Soviet Military Administration thereupon promptly arrested the director, whose office was located in the Soviet sector, and appointed its own designee as his successor.

Earlier, on July 26, 1948, the Magistrat had been ordered by the Soviet authorities to establish a separate section in the Central Food Office to carry out the Soviet offer of food rations to all inhabitants of Berlin provided that they registered with shops in the Soviet sector. The following day the Soviet authorities informed the personnel of the Central Food Office that they had one hour in which to decide whether to work with them on the Soviet program. The result was a division in the food office in which Soviet sector food distribution was controlled by the Soviet Military Administration while the Magistrat's Central Food Office continued to have jurisdiction over food distribution in the Western sectors.

The Soviet authorities also introduced other measures dividing the Soviet sector from the Western sectors in connection with the blockade of Berlin; and the City Assembly was obliged long before

THE UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

the events of 30 November to move its headquarters to the Western sectors because of the Soviet failure to provide protection against mob demonstrations organized by the Socialist Unity party. Many of the departments of the Magistrat were likewise compelled to move to the Western sectors.

The above are examples of Soviet actions extended over a period of many months to bring about a piecemeal (and finally a total) division of the city by constant interference in the normal processes of the unified German city administration. The Western powers, on the other hand, have constantly maintained a policy of non-interference with the legitimate and quadripartite authorized functioning of the city government. It has been their conviction that interference is unfortunate because (a) it destroys the unity upon which the constitutional administration of the city of Berlin depends, and (b) believing as they do in the basic importance of the role of law in democratic life, they cannot countenance the systematic and arbitrary actions of the Soviet Military Administration to set aside laws adopted by the people and approved by quadripartite agreement.

A case in point is the city elections which must take place during 1948 as provided by the temporary constitution approved by all four occupying powers under the terms of which the city administration has been operating since 1946. Although the Soviet authorities professed agreement

as to the desirability of free democratic elections throughout Berlin, the Soviet commandant stipulated conditions precedent to the holding of an election which were known to be unacceptable to the city assembly.

The purpose of these conditions was clearly revealed when, following their rejection by the City Assembly, the Soviet authorities forbade the holding of the elections in the Soviet sector. The Western Allies, on the contrary, regard the elections as a purely German matter and as such they will take place in the Western sectors on December 5, the date arranged by the proper German authorities.

The Soviet authorities have refused to recognize the validity of the elections on December 5 and instead have proceeded since November 30 as previously described to the establishment in the Soviet sector of an unconstitutional body with no claim whatever to represent the people of the city of Berlin or even of the Soviet sector. These developments pose new and grave problems for the solution of Berlin's currency difficulties.

These new problems have arisen because of interference on the part of Soviet authorities with the normal workings of the Berlin constitution; they could even now be set aside if the Soviet authorities were to disown the unconstitutional body created in the Soviet sector on November 30, 1948, and in conformity with the constitution permit elections to be held on a city-wide basis.

Resolutions on the Special Committee on the Balkans¹

Conventions and Refugees

B. The General Assembly

Recommends that Greece, on the one hand, and Bulgaria and Albania, on the other, establish diplomatic relations with each other, the absence of which is harmful to the relations between these countries;

Recommends the Governments of Greece, Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia to renew the previously operative conventions for the settlement of frontier questions or to conclude new ones, and also to settle the question of refugees in the spirit of mutual understanding and the establishment of good neighbour relations;

Furthermore recommends the Governments of Greece, Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia to inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations at the end of six months, for communication to

Member States of the United Nations, of the fulfilment of the above-mentioned recommendations.

Greek Children

C. The General Assembly

Recommends the return to Greece of Greek children at present away from their homes when the children, their father or mother or, in his or her absence, their closest relative, express a wish to that effect;

Invites all the Members of the United Nations and other States on whose territory these children are to be found to take the necessary measures for implementation of the present recommendation;

Instructs the Secretary-General to request the International Committee of the Red Cross and the League of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies to organize and ensure liaison with the national Red Cross organizations of the States concerned with a view to empowering the national Red Cross organizations to adopt measures in the respective countries for implementing the present recommendation.

¹ Contained in U.N. doc. A/728, Nov. 18, 1948, and A/728/Corr.1, Nov. 19, 1948. Parts B and C of the resolution were adopted by the General Assembly on Nov. 27, 1948. For the text of Part A, see the BULLETIN of Dec. 5, 1948, p. 697, and Nov. 21, 1948, p. 635.

Discussion of Israeli Application for Membership

STATEMENT BY PHILIP C. JESSUP¹

Deputy U.S. Representative in the Security Council

Mr. President: I believe that it is quite appropriate and useful that you should have called the Council's attention to the provision of rule 59 which you have just read. This is a statement of the rule which the Security Council follows in connection with matters involving applications for membership in the United Nations. I should like to comment also, Mr. President, upon the provisions of rule 60. It is true that under rule 60, in the normal course of events, it is contemplated that applications for membership may be received at any time during the year and that the Security Council should take action upon such applications for membership sufficiently in advance of a session of the General Assembly to enable its recommendation to be considered by members of that body before they meet. However, in the last paragraph of rule 60, namely, in the fifth paragraph of rule 60, we read that in special circumstances the Security Council may decide to make a recommendation to the General Assembly concerning an application for membership subsequent to the expiration of the time limit set forth in the preceding paragraph. In other words, that they may deal with applications for membership in the Council in special circumstances.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that in connection with the application for membership of the Provisional Government of Israel the Security Council is confronted with "special circumstances" and it is for that reason that I wish to speak upon this subject even in advance of the normal reference of this matter to the committee of the Council in accordance with rule 59 which you have read.

It is well known, Mr. President, that the United States fully supports and will vote affirmatively on the application of the state of Israel for membership in the United Nations. It is our hope that the Security Council will shortly approve this application so that the Provisional Government of Israel can attain favorable action by the General Assembly and may be admitted as the 59th Member of the United Nations before the end of the Assembly's present session.

We are all aware, Mr. President, that even while we are meeting here in the Security Council, the First Committee of the General Assembly is also devoting itself to the question of the future situation of Palestine and that their deliberations are closely connected with our consideration here of

Israel's application for membership. The attitude on the part of my Government in full support of the admission of the state of Israel in the United Nations is certainly not a matter which will cause any surprise to any member of this Council. Over a year ago the United States gave its support to the principles of the majority plan proposed by the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine. That plan envisaged the creation of both a Jewish state and an Arab state in Palestine. We gave our support to the resolution of November 29, 1947, by which the General Assembly recommended a plan for the future government of Palestine involving as one of its elements the establishment of a Jewish state in part of Palestine.

Following the proclamation of the independence of Israel on May 14, 1948, the United States extended immediate and full recognition to the state of Israel and recognized the Provisional Government of Israel as a *de facto* authority of the new state. On frequent occasions since that date American officials, including the President and the Secretary of State, have affirmed that the United States looks forward to the admission of the state of Israel to the United Nations. In the remarks which I had the honor to make on behalf of my Delegation in the First Committee of the General Assembly on November 19th, I invited the attention of the Committee to the statement which the Foreign Minister of the Provisional Government of Israel had made asking for the admission of Israel to the United Nations, and I then said on behalf of my Delegation:

"The United States looks forward to the admission of the state of Israel to the United Nations and to its active participation in our work. To this end we hope that the Security Council will be able, in the near future, to recommend Israel as a state duly qualified for membership."

The Charter of the United Nations in article 4 specifies that membership in the United Nations is open to—and I quote the words of the Charter—"peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations". This formulation

¹ Made before the Security Council in Paris on Dec. 2, 1948, and released to the press on the same date.

comprises the requirements laid down by the Charter for admission of new members to the United Nations. Reduced to their essence these requirements are as follows: The political entity in question must be a state; it must be a "peace-loving" state; it must accept the obligations contained in the Charter; and it must be able and willing, in the judgment of the United Nations, to carry out these obligations. My Government considers that the state of Israel meets these Charter requirements.

The first question which may be raised in analyzing this fourth article of the Charter and its application to the membership of the state of Israel is the question whether Israel is a "state", as that term is used in article 4 of the Charter. It is common knowledge, Mr. President, that while there are traditional definitions of a state in international law, the term has been used in many different ways. We are all aware that under the traditional definition of a state in international law all of the great writers have pointed to four qualifications:

First: There must be a people.

Second: There must be a territory.

Third: There must be a government.

Fourth: There must be capacity to enter into relations with other states of the world.

So far as the question of capacity to enter into relations with other states of the world is concerned, learned academic arguments can be and have been made to the effect that we already have among the Members of the United Nations some political entities which do not possess full sovereign freedom to form their own international policy which traditionally has been considered characteristic of a state. We know, however, that neither at San Francisco nor subsequently has the United Nations considered that complete freedom to frame and manage one's own foreign policy was an essential requisite of United Nations' membership. I dwell upon this point, Mr. President, not because anyone has ever questioned that in this respect Israel is free and unhampered; in this respect I believe that there would be unanimity that Israel exercises complete independence of judgment and of will in forming and in executing its foreign policy. The reason I mention the qualifications of this aspect of the traditional definition of a state is to underline the point that the term "state" as used and applied in article 4 of the Charter of the United Nations may not be wholly identical with the term "state" as it is used and defined in classic textbooks of international law. When we look at the other classic attributes of a state we find insistence that it must also have a government. No one doubts that Israel has a government. I think the world has been particularly impressed with the way in which the people of Israel have organized their government

and have established a firm system of administration and of lawmaking under the most difficult conditions. Although, pending their scheduled elections, they still modestly and appropriately call themselves the "Government of Israel", they have a legislative body which makes laws; they have a judiciary which interprets and applies these laws; and they have an executive which carries out the laws and which has at its disposal a considerable force which is responsive to its will.

According to the same classical definition, we are told that a state must have a people and territory. Nobody questions the fact that the state of Israel has a people. It is an extremely homogeneous people: a people full of loyalty and of enthusiastic devotion to the state of Israel.

The argument seems chiefly to arise in connection with territory. One does not find in the general classic treatment of this subject any insistence that the territory of a state must be exactly fixed by definite frontiers. We all know that historically many states have begun their existence with their frontiers unsettled. Let me take as one example my own country—the United States. Like the state of Israel it had at its origin certain territory along the seacoast. It had various indeterminate claims to an extended territory westward, but in the case of the United States, that land had not even been explored and no one knew just where the American claims ended and where French and British and Spanish claims began. To the north, the exact delimitation of the frontier with the territories of Great Britain was not settled until many years later. And yet I maintain, Mr. President, that in the light of history and in the light of a practice and acceptance by other states, the existence of the United States of America was not in question before its final boundaries were determined.

Although the formulas in the classic treatises vary somewhat one from the other, both reason and history demonstrate that the concept of territory does not necessarily include precise delimitation of the boundaries of that territory. The reason for the rule that one of the necessary attributes of a state is that it shall possess territory, is that one can not contemplate a state as a kind of disembodied spirit. Historically the concept is one of insisting that there must be some portion of the earth's surface which its people inhabit and over which its government exercises authority. No one can deny that the state of Israel responds to this requirement.

Similarly, Mr. President, it is the view of my Government that Israel is a peace-loving nation. The Jewish community in Palestine which created the state of Israel expressed its willingness and readiness a year ago to accept the General Assembly resolution of November 29, 1947, and to cooperate loyally in carrying it out. Members of the Council in reflecting upon the efforts of this

body over the past year to maintain peace in Palestine will recall the degree to which the Provisional Government of Israel has extended its cooperation to the implementation of proposals made by the Security Council or by the mediator. For instance, when the first truce in Palestine was about to expire on July 9, 1948, the Provisional Government of Israel indicated its willingness to observe the truce under substantially the same conditions as those governing the truce then in existence. When this proposal, which had been made by the mediator, was not found acceptable by all the governments and authorities concerned, the Provisional Government of Israel indicated its willingness to accept a further proposal of the mediator for an unconditional cease-fire in Palestine for a period of ten days. Since that date, representatives of the Provisional Government of Israel have repeatedly made clear in this form, and elsewhere, their willingness to seek a settlement, through the processes of negotiation and with appropriate assistance of United Nations mediatory or conciliatory bodies, of all outstanding problems between Israel and other governments and authorities.

As to the third of the Charter requirements, the state of Israel in the terms of its application for membership has indicated its acceptance of the obligations contained in the Charter. There is no reason for the Security Council to question the solemn assurance of Israel that it does accept the obligations of the Charter. One of these obligations is stated in article 25 under its terms, and I quote them: "The Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter." If Israel is admitted to the United Nations, this Charter obligation will be binding upon Israel just as it is binding upon the United States and all other Members of the United Nations.

Article 4 of the Charter also requires that a state which is admitted to membership in the United Nations be able and willing, in the judgment of the United Nations, to carry out the obligations contained in the present Charter. It is the judgment of the United States, as one of the Members of the United Nations, that the state of Israel is able and willing to carry out the obligations imposed by the Charter. The willingness of Israel to carry out these obligations is made clear in its letter of application for membership. My Government is also satisfied as regards the ability of the state of Israel to carry out the obligations of the Charter. The state of Israel is a functioning political entity with firmly established governmental institutions exercising effective internal administration and able to conduct the foreign relations of the state. It is clear to me that, judged by whatever standards of political and social organization, Israel is able to carry out the obligations of the Charter of the United Nations

and to assist the United Nations in achieving the high purposes set forth in the Charter.

Mr. President, as a result of this inspection of the requirements for membership in the United Nations as set out in article 4 of the Charter and of their application to the specific situation of Israel, my Delegation reaches the definite conclusion that the state of Israel is qualified for membership and that its application should be endorsed by the Security Council.

There is one other point, Mr. President, to which I should like to refer since it is a matter which arises in consideration and in debate on questions involving applications for membership. The matter to which I refer is the relationship between action by the Security Council or by the United Nations upon application for membership and the problem of recognition of a Government or State.

We are aware, Mr. President, that there are Members of the United Nations who do not maintain diplomatic relations with other Members of the United Nations. Full membership in the United Nations does not necessarily involve bilateral diplomatic relationships among those Members.

I think, Mr. President, that confusion has arisen on this subject of the relationship of the recognition of governments and the admission of states to membership in the United Nations.

I would like to remind members of the Council that the same problem has come to our attention that has caused debate in this body in regard to the appearance of various political entities at this table in matters where their affairs have been discussed. The case of Indonesia comes to mind. We have had similar debates in regard to the seating of the representatives of the state of Israel at this table, and I believe, Mr. President, that the Security Council has fully recognized in that connection through a series of discussions, debates, and practices that the admission of a representative to this table and participation in the discussions does not involve the question of recognition of governments.

Similarly, Mr. President, it is my opinion that just as the existence of diplomatic relations among Members of the United Nations on a bilateral basis is not a feature inherent in full membership in the organization, so the question of the extension of bilateral diplomatic recognition or relationships between a Member of the United Nations and a new Member of the United Nations is not a question which lies at the root of action upon application for membership. Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me that that issue is not one which should confuse our consideration of the applicability of article 4 of the Charter to any applicant for membership.

Now, Mr. President, I have discussed the question of the application of Israel for membership

in the United Nations in terms of legal analysis of the provisions of the Charter which are relevant to this particular suggestion. But I believe, Mr. President, that we all realize, all of us, members of the Council and all Members of the United Nations, that we are dealing here with something more than questions of legal concepts and of provisions in a document, although we desire and will be guided by the terms of that instrument.

We are dealing here with a desire of a people who have laboriously constructed a community, an authority, and finally a government operating in an independent state to see the state which they have thus arduously built take its place among the Members of the United Nations.

The United States has watched with sympathy and interest the birth of the state of Israel and the development of its political and social institutions. We are looking toward the first general elections to be held by the state of Israel early in the new year. We shall await with anticipation the full development of the state of Israel, of political institutions and practices in the best of the democratic tradition.

My Government, Mr. President, supports the application of the Government of Israel for membership in the United Nations not merely because we consider that Israel fulfils the technical requirements of the Charter in this regard, but because we believe that the state of Israel, its government, and its people will contribute substantially to the work and development of the United Nations organization.

Finally, Mr. President, as I began with a ref-

erence to the last paragraph of rule 60 of the rules of procedure of the Council, I wish to close with a reference to the procedural aspects of this question. There is no use, Mr. President, in any of us avoiding the clear recognition of the fact that we are approaching the closing days of the session of the General Assembly. I have already mentioned the fact that the First Committee is in the midst of its consideration of the future situation of Palestine. Surely, Mr. President, it is of great importance, it is of great value in reaching that final adjustment, a peaceful settlement of the Palestinian question, that Israel should take its place among the Members of the United Nations equally bound by the Charter, equally responsible to the obligations of the Charter.

It is my opinion therefore, Mr. President, and the opinion of my Government, that these are special circumstances within the meaning of the last paragraph of rule 60 and that the Security Council should so decide and I should hope, Mr. President, that as this matter is automatically referred to the Committee under rule 60 of our rules of procedure that you as President would indicate to that Committee on Admissions the urgency of this problem and that that Committee will report back to this body certainly not later than Monday of next week their conclusions upon this question, in order that the Security Council may take its action, and I should hope a favorable action, which would enable the General Assembly in turn to approve the application of Israel for membership in this organization.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Resolution Establishing Conciliation Commission for Palestine¹

The General Assembly,

HAVING ADOPTED on 29 November 1947 resolution 181 (II) regarding the future government of Palestine and providing a plan for partition with economic union;

HAVING ADOPTED on 14 May 1948 resolution 186 (S-2) empowering a U.N. Mediator in Palestine to exercise certain functions including the use of his good offices to promote a peaceful adjustment of the future situation of Palestine;

HAVING RECEIVED and examined the progress report of the U. N. Mediator on Palestine (A/648) submitted by the late Count Folke Bernadotte;

HAVING TAKEN NOTE of the resolutions of the Security Council concerning the truce in Palestine and of the resolution of 16 November 1948 con-

cerning the establishment of an armistice by means of negotiations conducted either directly or through the Acting Mediator on Palestine;

1. *Expresses* its deep appreciation of the progress achieved through the good offices of the late U.N. Mediator in promoting a peaceful adjustment of the future situation of Palestine for which cause he sacrificed his life; and

Extends its thanks to the Acting Mediator and his staff for their continued efforts and devotion to duty in Palestine;

2. *Establishes* a Conciliation Commission consisting of (three states members of the United Nations) which shall have the following functions:

(A) To assume, insofar as it considers necessary in existing circumstances, the functions given to the U.N. Mediator on Palestine by the resolution of the General Assembly of 14 May 1948;

(B) To carry out the specific functions and di-

¹ Adopted by Committee I on Dec. 4, 1948, by a vote of 25 to 21 with 3 absentees. Printed from telegraphic text.

rectives given to it by this resolution and such additional functions and directives as may be given to it by the General Assembly or by the Security Council;

(C) To promote good relations between the state of Israel, the Arabs of Palestine and the neighbouring Arab states;

(D) To undertake, upon the request of the Security Council, any of the functions now assigned to the U.N. Mediator on Palestine or to the U.N. Truce Commission by resolutions of the Security Council; upon such request to the Conciliation Commission by the Security Council with respect to all the remaining functions of the U.N. Mediator on Palestine under Security Council resolutions, the office of the Mediator shall be terminated;

3. *Decides* that the three members of the Conciliation Commission shall be chosen by a committee of the Assembly consisting of the representatives of China, France, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom and United States of America;

4. *Requests* the Commission to begin its functions at once, with a view to the establishment of contact between the parties themselves and the Commission at the earliest possible date;

5. *Calls* upon the governments and authorities concerned to extend the scope of the negotiations provided for in the Security Council resolution of 16 November 1948 and to seek agreement by negotiations conducted either through the Conciliation Commission or directly with a view to a final settlement of all questions outstanding between them;

6. *Instructs* the Conciliation Commission to take steps to assist the governments and authorities concerned to achieve a final settlement of all questions outstanding between them;

7. *Resolves* that the holy places, religious buildings and sites in Palestine should be protected and free access to them assured, in accordance with existing rights and historical practice; that arrangements to this end should be under effective U.N. supervision, that the U.N. Conciliation Commission in presenting to the fourth regular session of the General Assembly its detailed proposal for a permanent international regime for the territory of Jerusalem should include recommendations concerning the holy places in that territory; that with regard to the holy places in the rest of Palestine, the Commission should call upon the political authorities of the areas concerned to give appropriate formal guarantees as to the protection of the holy places and access to them; and that these undertakings should be presented to the General Assembly for approval;

8. *Resolves* that in view of its association with three world religions, the Jerusalem area, as defined in the General Assembly resolution of 29 November 1947, should be accorded special and

separate treatment from the rest of Palestine and should be placed under effective U.N. control;

Requests the Security Council to take further steps to ensure the demilitarization of Jerusalem at the earliest possible date;

Instructs the Conciliation Commission:

To present to the fourth regular session of the General Assembly detailed proposals for a permanent international regime for the Jerusalem area which will provide for the maximum local autonomy for distinctive groups consistent with the special international status of the Jerusalem area;

The Conciliation Commission is authorized to appoint a U.N. representative who shall cooperate with the local authorities with respect to the interim administration of the Jerusalem area;

9. *Resolves* that, pending agreement on more detailed arrangements among the governments and authorities concerned, the freest possible access to Jerusalem by road, rail or air should be accorded to all inhabitants of Palestine; and

Instructs the Conciliation Commission to report immediately to the Security Council for appropriate action by that organ any attempt by any party to impede such access;

10. *Instructs* the Conciliation Commission to seek arrangements among the governments and authorities concerned which will facilitate the economic development of the area, including arrangements for access to ports and airfields and the use of transportation and communication facilities; in this connection, the conclusions contained in part I, section VIII, paragraph 4 (E) and (F) of the progress report of the U.N. Mediator should be taken into account;

11. *Endorses* the conclusions stated in part I, section VIII, paragraph 4 (I) of the progress report of the U.N. Mediator in Palestine, and

Resolves that the refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbours should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date, and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return and for loss of or damage to property which under principles of international law or in equity should be made good by the governments or authorities responsible; and

Instructs the Conciliation Commission to facilitate the repatriation, resettlement and economic and social rehabilitation of the refugees and the payment of compensation and to maintain close relations with the director of the U.N. relief for Palestine refugees, and through him with the appropriate organs and agencies of the U.N.;

12. *Authorizes* the Conciliation Commission to appoint such subsidiary bodies and to employ such technical experts, acting under its authority, as it may find necessary to the effective discharge of its functions and responsibilities under this resolution.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

The Conciliation Commission will have its official headquarters at Jerusalem. The authorities responsible for maintaining order in Jerusalem will be responsible for taking all measures necessary to ensure the security of the Commission. The Secretary-General will provide a limited number of guards for the protection of the staff and premises of the Commission;

13. *Instructs* the Conciliation Commission to render progress reports periodically to the Sec-

retary-General for transmission to the Security Council and to members of the U.N.;

14. *Calls upon* all governments and authorities concerned to cooperate with the Conciliation Commission and to take all possible steps to assist in the implementation of this resolution;

15. *Requests* the Secretary-General to provide the necessary staff and facilities and to make appropriate arrangements to provide the necessary funds required in carrying out the terms of this resolution.

The United States in the United Nations

[December 4-12]

U.N. Recognizes Republic of Korea

The General Assembly passed on December 12 the resolution approved by the Political and Security Committee on December 8 which "declares that there has been established a lawful government (the Government of the Republic of Korea)"; this action recognizes the "South Korean Government" and also urges the continuation of the work of the Temporary Commission. The resolution further recommends the withdrawal of occupation forces from Korea as early as practicable.

The resolution follows closely the draft submitted by the United States, China, and Australia on December 6 to Committee I, but which was amended by Canada in the discussion before the General Assembly.

The United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea, established by the General Assembly in November 1947, will continue to seek means for bringing about the unification of Korea and the integration of all Korean security forces. The Commission is to proceed to Korea within 30 days of adoption of the resolution, and according to the resolution, will observe the withdrawal of the occupying forces.

The debate on Korea began in Committee I on December 6 with the question of participation of Korean representatives in committee discussions. The Soviet bloc efforts to seat representatives of the North Korean regime were rejected by 34 to 6 with 8 abstentions; on the other hand, a Chinese resolution inviting participation without vote by representatives of South Korea was approved by 39 to 6 with 1 abstention. China replied to a Czech proposal for North Korean participation on the grounds that, since elections in the north had not been supervised by the U.N. Commission, to invite North Korean representatives would have a bad psychological effect throughout Korea. The

United States supported China and recalled that the General Assembly last year decided to invite only "duly elected representatives of the Korean people".

John Foster Dulles stated the U.S. position on Korea before Committee I on December 7; he pointed out that the Republic of Korea, whose capital is at Seoul in the southern or U.S. zone, was established through free, U.N.-observed elections last May. By contrast in the northern or Soviet zone Mr. Dulles said "there has been brought into being a Communist-controlled regime that asserts pretensions to govern all Korea and that threatens to back those pretensions by force and violence". He urged adoption of the joint resolution and pointed out that the United Nations cannot consider its task completed. "Further measures are required", he said. "First of all, the United Nations ought to put the seal of legitimacy on what has been done under its auspices. The Government of the Republic of Korea needs that in order to maintain its prestige and authority at home and abroad. . . . In the second place, we believe that the United Nations should continue a commission on Korea in order to help the new Government of Korea to end the wartime military occupation of Korea. . . . In the third place, we believe that the United Nations Commission should help the Korean people to reunite and to end the economic dislocations, the fears of civil war, that now gravely disturb the life of the people. As in the case of Greece, Communist elements seek, by violence, to impose their will and there is danger that these efforts will be supported in one form or another by neighboring Communist regimes. . . . We also believe the United Nations commission may be able through good offices to help break down peacefully the barrier to friendly intercourse caused by the present division of Korea."

Genocide Convention

An international convention on genocide outlawing mass extermination of religious, racial, and national groups was adopted by the General Assembly on December 9.

President Herbert Evatt termed approval of the convention as an epoch-making event and a "significant advance in the development of international criminal law". Mr. Evatt urged that it "be signed by all states and ratified by all parliaments at the earliest date in order that basic human rights may be given the protection of international law for the sake of social progress and international peace". The convention was opened for signature on December 11.

Ernest Gross, U.S. Delegate, announced that the United States was prepared to sign the convention and expressed the hope that all member states would do likewise. The convention was adopted by a vote of 55 to 0, with only Costa Rica, El Salvador, and the Union of South Africa absent.

Of the two resolutions adopted relating to the implementation of the convention and applying to it, one urged extension of its provisions to dependent territories as soon as possible and the other asked that the International Law Commission study the desirability and possibility of establishing a Criminal Chamber of the International Court of Justice.

Human Rights

Committee III (Social, Humanitarian, and Cultural) approved on December 7 a universal declaration of human rights, two and one-half years after detailed work first began on the document. The vote was 29 to 0, with 7 abstentions. Also approved was an amended French resolution calling for wide publicity for the declaration, to include its reading in schools and publication in all languages as well as a New Zealand proposal asking the Economic and Social Council to give priority to preparation of a draft convention on human rights.

The declaration was further approved when the General Assembly voted its adoption on December 10 by a vote of 48 to 0, with 8 abstentions, with one amendment by the United Kingdom incorporated.

Assembly Asks Security Council to Reconsider Membership Applications

In a series of resolutions approved at a plenary session on December 8 the General Assembly called upon the Security Council to reconsider the applications of 12 nations for membership in the United Nations. The Assembly placed particular emphasis on the applications which have been vetoed by the U.S.S.R., after having been approved by the required majority of the Security Council's members.

The Assembly asked the Security Council to review the Soviet-vetoed requests of Austria,

Ceylon, Ireland, Finland, Italy, Portugal, and Transjordan, along with the applications of Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, and the Mongolian Peoples' Republic, which failed to get the necessary majority when brought before the Council.

Prior to voting, Benjamin Cohen, U.S. Delegate, told the Assembly that the United States would not veto the application of any nation which is approved by seven of the 11 members. "We cannot abdicate our own judgment", Mr. Cohen said, "but we will not, on matters of membership, put our judgment above the judgment of the world community of nations. We shall not falter in our efforts to insure the admission of every qualified state to this organization."

Mr. Cohen expressed the U.S. support of Ceylon's application but added that the United States would support the application of any nation that could fulfill the requirements of the Charter. The United States, he said, would support the requests of Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania when those nations could show that they are living up to their obligations under the treaties of peace. Albania, he indicated, could expect U.S. acceptance when it could show that Bulgaria and she are complying with the General Assembly resolutions calling for cessation of aid to the Greek guerrillas; the Mongolian Peoples' Republic would have to prove it is truly independent before it would receive U.S. support.

The Assembly also approved an Australian resolution asking all Security Council members to act in accordance with an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice which said that consent to the admission of an applicant may not be dependent upon conditions other than those specified in the Charter.

Four-Power Veto Proposal

After a week of debate Committee I approved on December 4 by a vote of 33 to 6 with 4 abstentions, a resolution recommending that the General Assembly ask the Security Council to limit use of the voting privilege which the U.S.S.R. has employed to obstruct the work of that body.

The resolution proposed by the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and China, lists 35 kinds of decisions as procedural and therefore not subject to the rule of the unanimity of the permanent members. It also asks those members not to use the veto on proposals which have been approved by any seven members of the Council and recommends that the veto be used as little as possible on all other proposals. The only negative votes cast on the resolution were those of the Soviet Union and the Eastern European countries.

In completing discussion on Security Council voting procedure, the committee did not pass an Argentine proposal that a special general conference be called to amend the Charter to abolish the

THE UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

veto. The vote on this question was 12 for and 23 against. A Soviet resolution affirming that the rule of unanimity is an important condition to maintaining peace and security was defeated by 23 to 6 with 9 abstentions. Final action on this item of the agenda was the defeat of an Australian proposal limiting use of the veto to occasions when there has been a breach of the peace, aggression, or a threat to the peace, by a vote of 22 to 9 with 10 abstentions.

Aid for Underdeveloped Nations

Four proposals aimed at giving new economic and technical aid to needy nations have been adopted by the General Assembly as recommended by Committee II (Economic and Financial).

One proposal, intended to focus attention on the problem of economic life in the underdeveloped areas of the world urged the Economic and Social Council and the specialized agencies to give "further and urgent consideration to the whole problem of economic development" of handicapped countries.

Another urged the Economic and Social Council to expedite its consideration of establishing a Middle East Economic Commission similar to those already formed for Europe, Latin America, and the Far East.

A third resolution called for the provision of technical assistance to countries in need of it by such means as United Nations organized international teams of experts to advise nations on their economic development programs.

A fourth resolution requested the International Labor Organization to examine the most appropriate means of gaining admission to the world's technician training centers of apprentices and workers from countries lacking enough technicians and specialists for their adequate economic development. All the recommendations were given approval at the December 4 session of the General Assembly.

UNAC Extended Through 1949

On December 8 the General Assembly by a vote of 32 to 0 with 5 abstentions extended the United Nations Appeal for Children for another year. The resolution defined the appeal as "a world-wide voluntary appeal for non-governmental contributions to be used for the benefit of children, adolescents and expectant and nursing mothers without discriminations on account of race, religion, nationality or political belief."

In continuing the UNAC, the General Assembly specified that "proceeds of the collections in each country shall be for the benefit of the U.N. International Children's Emergency Fund." The idea for the appeal originated in a resolution approved by the Assembly in December 1946, urging the Secretary-General to explore the possibility of world-wide voluntary contributions of "one day's

pay" to aid the ICEF. Thereafter the Economic and Social Council established the UNAC to assist in raising funds. Last month, contributions had reached \$30,755,841.

Conciliation Commission for Palestine

On December 11 the General Assembly passed an amended resolution establishing a Conciliation Commission for Palestine consisting of three states. China, France, the U.S.S.R., the U.K., and the U.S. were named to submit a proposal for the membership of the commission.

Relief for Palestine Refugees

Stanton Griffis, U.S. Ambassador to Egypt, was appointed by the Secretary-General as Director of the United Nations Relief for Palestine Refugees. The appointment was made public in Paris on December 4. The refugee-aid program approved by the General Assembly, will cover the period from December 1, 1948, to August 31, 1949; it consists of \$29,500,000 for aid and \$2,500,000 for administrative expenses.

Israeli Membership

The membership committee of the Security Council referred on December 7 back to the Council with no recommendations the application of the Provisional Government of Israel for membership in the United Nations.

Spanish Made a Working Language

Spanish has been adopted as a working language by the General Assembly. Meeting in a plenary session on December 7 a proposal to make Spanish a working language along with English and French was adopted by a vote of 32 to 20 with 5 abstentions.

Agenda Items Pending

To be discussed at the next regular session of the General Assembly are: proposed conventions on freedom of information, disposition of the pre-war Italian colonies in Africa, and a resolution on the marital rights of women introduced by Chile.

Adjournment

The General Assembly adjourned its present session the night of December 11-12 and will reconvene in New York on April 1, 1949. The following is the text of the resolution on adjournment adopted:

"The General Assembly decides that the present session in Paris adjourn on 11-12 December, 1948, and that a second part of the session be held at the headquarters of the United Nations in New York to complete consideration of the items on the agenda, the resumption in New York to take place on 1 April, 1949."

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

Eighth World's Poultry Congress

BY W. D. TERMOHLEN

The Eighth World's Poultry Congress was held at Copenhagen August 20-27, 1948. The Congress, the first held since the end of World War II, resulted in the re-establishment of international cooperation, which had been so beneficial to the world's industry since the First World's Poultry Congress was held at The Hague in 1921.

Representatives of 35 countries, representing all areas of the world, met to discuss problems and the results of scientific work and practical experimentation which have occurred since the Seventh Congress, held at Cleveland, Ohio, in 1939. From the 35 countries represented, there were almost 900 persons present, nearly 90 of whom were from the United States. Twenty-one countries were represented by official delegations; these were: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Eire, Finland, France, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, the Union of South Africa, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

To the poultrymen of Europe the Congress was of inestimable value for the reasons so aptly expressed by Kristen Bording, Minister of Agriculture for Denmark, who said in his welcoming remarks at the opening of the Congress:

"Since the holding of the Seventh World's Poultry Congress in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1939, the poultrymen have had to work under very difficult conditions. To the European countries the great war meant not only difficult times with declining production, scarcity of feeding material, and destruction of the machinery of production, but also that each country was shut off from intercourse with other countries and with our friends outside Europe".

World's Poultry Congresses provide the setting for the triennial meetings of the World's Poultry Science Association, a world-wide organization of people engaged in the poultry industry activities. One of the principal objects of this Association is to facilitate in all possible ways the exchange of knowledge and experience among persons in all parts of the world who are contributing to the advancement of the poultry industry by teaching, experiments, research, demonstrations, organization, or any other constructive manner to promote the extension of knowledge. Professor James E. Rice,

formerly head of the Poultry Department of Cornell University, a member of the United States Official Delegation and president of the World's Poultry Science Association since 1939, in complimenting the Danish Committee and Congress officials for the excellent manner in which the Congress had been organized and operated said:

"This Congress has unquestionably brought material assistance to the poultry industry, especially of Europe, and has made possible the extension of enlightenment, better living, happiness, and the appreciation of the democratic way of life to many peoples throughout the world. This Congress will be a milestone in the history of the world's poultry industry".

The Congress was officially opened in the Town Hall August 20, by His Highness, Prince Knude, brother of His Majesty, King Frederik IX. In the afternoon the exhibit held in the Forum Building was opened by Prince Knude. The exhibit consisted of 34 educational and commercial exhibits and 1,544 live birds including chickens, turkeys, ducks, geese, and pigeons. The entire exhibit depicted the poultry industry of Denmark and its progress and development.

On August 21, the opening plenary session was held in the Broadcasting House. Five general papers or reports were presented on subjects of nutrition, incubation, breeding, disease, and marketing by representatives from Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Beginning August 23 and continuing through August 26, five sectional meetings were held daily in the Congress Building. The subject matter covered in these meetings was as follows: section 1—nutrition and physiology; section 2—genetics and incubation; section 3—organization, breed, and development of the poultry industry; section 4—marketing, public service, et cetera; and section 5—diseases and their control. The sectional meetings filled to capacity the meeting rooms, and in connection with most of the 132 papers presented there was good discussion.

The official languages of the Congress were English, Danish, and French. Most of the papers were presented in English, and well over 90 percent of the Congress members participating spoke and understood English. The complete text and résumé of all 137 general reports and sectional papers were included in the Official Report, volume I, of the Congress.

ACTIVITIES AND DEVELOPMENTS

The closing plenary session was held on August 27. In addition to the appropriate resolution of thanks, there were unanimously passed three resolutions proposing activities to be carried on by the World's Poultry Science Association through representative committees. These resolutions covered the following: study of practical uniform international standards and grades for eggs and poultry and uniformity of containers which could be useful throughout the world; study of a uniform method for reporting results of egg-laying contests to afford more intelligent and helpful use of such reports throughout the world; and third, calling to the attention of the proper authorities the need for uniformity of method in making vitamin D chick assays. The Congress was adjourned by the president of the Congress, W. A. Kock, Denmark, consultant in the Ministry of Agriculture of that country.

The chairman of the United States Delegation, W. D. Termohlen, Director, Poultry Branch, Production and Marketing Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture, was elected president of the World's Poultry Science Association for the three-year (1949-51) term. Other Americans elected as officers of the Association were: Professor James E. Rice, honorary past president; Dr. G. F. Heuser, who continues as

secretary-treasurer; and Dr. O. B. Kent, Dr. M. A. Jull, Professor E. M. Funk, Dr. H. H. Alp, J. W. Kinghorne, and Dr. H. S. Wilgus, who were elected members of the Council.

Third North American Regional Broadcasting Conference Scheduled

On November 18 the Department announced that the Third North American Regional Broadcasting Conference (NARBA) is scheduled to be convened in Canada, probably at Ottawa or Montreal, on September 13, 1949. Accordingly, there is need to begin formulating the United States proposals for this Conference as soon as possible.

The results of the forthcoming North American Regional Broadcasting Conference are very closely related to the implementation of the domestic policies of the United States Government in the standard broadcasting field. Accordingly, the Department of State has requested the Federal Communications Commission, which is the arm of the Government having primary interest in this field, to assume the leadership for the preparatory work. The FCC has agreed to undertake these duties and plans to call a general meeting of the interested Government and industry people for this purpose.

International Joint Commission Hearings on Pollution of Boundary Waters

[Released to the press November 29]

In accordance with notice of hearings published by the International Joint Commission, the hearings on pollution of the Detroit River, Lake St. Clair, St. Clair River, and St. Marys River were resumed in Detroit, Michigan, on November 15, 1948. The hearings were conducted by the following representatives of the United States and Canadian Sections of the Commission:

United States Section

A. O. Stanley, Chairman
Eugene Weber, Commissioner
Jesse B. Ellis, Secretary
William R. Wallace, Counsel

Canadian Section

George Spence, Acting Chairman
Elizabeth M. Sutherland, Acting Secretary
K. J. Burbridge, Counsel

United States Section, Board of Technical Advisers

L. M. Fisher, sanitary engineer, Office of Chief of Engineering Activities, U.S. Public Health Service, Washington, D.C., Chairman
M. Le Bosquet, U.S. Public Health Service, Cincinnati, Ohio

Ralph Palange, U.S. Public Health Service, Detroit, Mich.
L. F. Oeming, Michigan Stream Control Commission, Lansing, Mich.

John M. Hepler, Michigan State Sanitary Engineer

Canadian Section, Board of Technical Advisers

George Ferguson, Consultant, Department of National Health and Welfare, Ontario Department of Health, Ottawa, Chairman

W. R. Edmonds, Department of National Health and Welfare, Ottawa

Dr. A. E. Berry, Ontario Department of Health, Toronto

A. V. DeLaporte, Ontario Department of Health, Toronto

The hearings began with the testimony of Allen T. Carlisle, city engineer for the city of Port Huron, Michigan, from which it appeared that raw sewage from the city was being dumped into the St. Clair River. Evidence was presented that the city had issued bonds in the sum of \$1,400,000 for the construction of a sewage-disposal plant and intercepting sewers, but that on account of increased costs of labor and materials the city had not proceeded with the construction of this plant. Reference was made to court proceedings brought by the State of Michigan to require the city of Port Huron to construct these disposal facilities, which are now awaiting decision by the Supreme Court of Michigan.

Department of State Bulletin

Evidence was also given by representatives or officers of the following municipalities: Marysville, St. Clair, St. Clair Shores, Marine City, Algonac, New Baltimore, Pontiac, Mt. Clemens, Dearborn, Melvindale, River Rouge, Ecorse, Wyandotte, Riverview, and Trenton, Michigan.

L. A. Danse described the action taken by General Motors Corporation to prevent industrial wastes from its several plants from entering boundary waters. T. Ledyard Blakeman, executive director of the Detroit Regional Planning Commission, described its proposals for disposing of sewage and industrial wastes.

Representatives of the Lake Carriers Association of Cleveland, Ohio, presented a statement on behalf of the owners of a large percentage of ships operated on the Great Lakes respecting the disposal of sewage, garbage, and other waste products from their vessels while operating in boundary waters. Further investigation of means for disinfecting or disposing of these materials on land were discussed, and further efforts at elimination of this source of pollution were promised.

A letter received from Harvey Campbell, vice president of the Detroit Chamber of Commerce, proposed that steps be taken to obtain water for the city and neighboring communities from Lake Huron.

On November 17 the hearings were transferred to the City Hall, Windsor, Ontario, Canada, and statements were received from a number of Canadian industries and municipalities that were contributing to the pollution of these boundary waters. Representatives appeared on behalf of salt, oil, gas, synthetic rubber, and chemical industries. Statements were also presented regarding materials dumped in the boundary waters or their tributaries by sugar-beet factories, canning factories, breweries, distilleries, and a company processing animal fats.

Representatives of the following municipalities also testified regarding their sewage-disposal problems and measures for remedying the existing situation: Sarnia, Point Edward, Wallaceburg, Chatham, Windsor, Amherstburg, Corruna, Moore Township, Courtright, Port Lambton, Belle River, Tecumseh, and Riverside.

The Commission also received important evidence regarding the extent of the pollution from representatives of the following Canadian organ-

izations: Ontario Federation of Commercial Fishermen, Port Dover; Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters, Windsor; Essex County Sportsmen's Association, Windsor; Wallaceburg Rod and Gun Club, Wallaceburg; and Kent County Sportsmen's Association, Chatham. The killing of ducks and fish in boundary waters on account of their pollution with oil and other deleterious substances was described, and the assistance of the Commission in preventing the destruction of these valuable natural resources was earnestly requested.

The Commission adjourned its sessions to Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, Canada, where evidence was received on Monday, November 22, regarding pollution of the St. Marys River. Evidence was received from representatives of the following corporations: Union Carbide Division of Union Carbide and Carbon Company; Northwestern Leather Company; Abitibi Power and Paper Company; Algoma Steel Corporation; Dominion Tar and Chemical Company, Ltd.; International Transit Company; and Algoma and Hudson Bay Railway Company. The Mayor and City Engineer of Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, and the Mayor and City Engineer of Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, presented plans which had been prepared for the erection of sewage-disposal plants. However, action thereon had been deferred on account of the high cost of labor and materials. Assurance was given to the Commission that efforts would be made to terminate the dumping of raw sewage from these cities into the St. Marys River and to construct sewage-disposal plants which would take care of the sanitary and industrial wastes that are now being dumped into the river.

The Board of Technical Advisers has been requested by the Commission to prepare a report to the Commission respecting conditions disclosed by these investigations in order that the Governments of Canada and the United States may take appropriate action in respect to the pollution of these boundary waters, which are covered by the following provision in article IV of the boundary waters treaty of January 11, 1909:

"It is further agreed that the waters herein defined as boundary waters and waters flowing across the boundary shall not be polluted on either side to the injury of health or property on the other."

THE RECORD OF THE WEEK

Views on Soviet Action Prior to Berlin Election

[Released to the press December 2]

Text of a letter of November 29, 1948, from Vasil Sokolovsky, Commander in Chief of the Soviet Occupation Forces in Berlin, to Lucius D. Clay, U.S. Commander-in-Chief and Military Governor in Berlin

The Soviet command cannot fail to call your attention to dangerous acts which are taking place in the Western sectors of Berlin for the disorganization and the splitting of German municipal administrative agencies and which are supported by the military commandants of the Western sectors.

As you know, Soviet military authorities in Berlin indicated the necessity of preserving the unity of Berlin, which is the capital of Germany, and insisted on conducting democratic elections for the whole of Berlin. This proposal was not taken into consideration. Instead of a single democratic election for the whole of Berlin, separate local elections in the Western sectors of Berlin have been arranged for December 5, elections which will be conducted not under conditions of democratic freedom but under conditions of persecution of democratic organizations and of compulsory measures.

[Released to the press December 2]

Text of General Clay's reply of November 30 to Marshal Sokolovsky. Identical letters were sent by Generals Brian Robertson and Pierre Koenig

I have received your communication of November 29, 1948 inviting my attention to certain actions taking place in Berlin preparatory to the election on December 5 of the Berlin City Assembly.

It is my understanding that the competent authorities of the City of Berlin, acting in accordance with the Berlin provisional constitution which was approved by the four occupying powers in 1946, are proceeding with elections on December 5 which are called for after the expiration of the two-year terms of the members of the City Assembly. The Berlin authorities in due course had addressed to each of the four commandants advice regarding their purpose to hold elections obedient to the constitution. The Commandants of the United Kingdom, France and the United States had of course no objection.

I notice that in the fourth paragraph of your letter you suggest that separatist elements in the Berlin Magistrat with the support of certain occupation authorities have been striving to disorganize its operation as a single municipal organization. This suggestion is one which neither I

Separate elections in the Western sectors on December 5 aim at liquidating united municipal administrative agencies, at creating a separate magistrat in the Western sectors for the uncontrolled management of these sectors by Western military authorities, and at encouraging the activities of the anti-democratic and openly reactionary elements of the city.

Moreover, for a long time already, separatist elements in the Berlin Magistrat who enjoy the support of certain occupation authorities have been striving to disorganize the operation of the Magistrat as a single municipal organization, also to expel from it the democratic representatives connected with large masses of the Berlin population. This is something to which the Soviet command cannot consent.

The Soviet command does not intend to encourage the actions of the anti-democratic elements of the Berlin Magistrat toward the splitting of German administrative agencies of Berlin, and, as in the past, will cooperate in preserving the unity of Berlin and in creating conditions which will insure normal activities for all democratic representatives in the agencies of the Berlin self-government.

nor any unbiased observer of the events of recent months can accept. The action of the Soviet authorities in permitting the disruption of the City Assembly by hooligan elements, their arbitrary dismissal of a number of duly elected city officials without the consent of the commandants of the three western sectors, and their abandonment of the Allied Kommandatura, together with innumerable other unilateral breaches of the quadripartite arrangements for Berlin, have demonstrated the intentions of the Soviet authorities to divide the city and to prevent the exercise of democratic rights and liberties in their own sector.

Moreover, a report has reached me according to which a dissident City Assembly, acting apparently with the connivance of the Soviet authorities have today proceeded to the illegal election of certain officers to the Magistrat, in direct contravention of the city constitution. If this report is confirmed, I should be grateful to be informed whether in fact the illegal action of these persons was taken with your approval.

For my own part I should add that I continue to desire to see reestablished at Berlin a situation corresponding to the accords which were concluded among us and which would permit under quadripartite control the unrestricted application of the Berlin constitution which was approved by the four occupying powers.

German and Austrian Immigration Opened to the United States¹

For the first time since 1941 it is possible for an ordinary resident of Germany or Austria without close relatives in the United States to register on a waiting list as a prospective immigrant to America.

One need not be a German or Austrian national to register in these countries. If a British subject, for example, is resident there, he may also fill out a registration form and, if born in Great Britain, his name will be placed on the British quota waiting list.

The resumption of regular immigration is a result of the Displaced Persons Act which Congress passed on June 19, Section 12, which directs that general consular activities in Germany and Austria be immediately resumed in order that German and Austrian quotas shall be available for applicants pursuant to the immigration laws. These laws provide a German quota of 25,957 per year with an additional 1,413 being allotted annually to Austria.

From the time these numbers were established in 1934 until the present time, the German annual quota has never been filled, although on the other hand the quota has never been closed—even during the war. Throughout all the time of hostilities Germans and Austrians residing outside of their homelands continued to go to America as regular immigrants. Thus many refugees from the Nazi regime found a new home in a free land.

Moreover, since the postwar reopening of American consular offices in Germany and Austria, the quotas have been used for persons entitled to preference visas—that is, parents of American citizens, husbands of American women, skilled agriculturists, and wives and unmarried minor children of legal residents of the United States. German and Austrian girls entering the United States as fiancées have also used up portions of the quotas. All together, some 15,000 Germans have entered the United States on immigrant visas since the end of hostilities.

Unfortunately for the thousands of Germans and Austrians now desiring to immigrate, the quota numbers have not been accumulating. Any of the 27,370 numbers granted under our quota system which are not used within a fiscal year are lost and cannot be utilized later. Thus the maximum number of German and Austrian born immigrants who can enter America this fiscal year—or any fiscal year—is 27,370.

In reality, because of another provision of the Displaced Persons Act, only about half this many native-born Germans and Austrians will enter

America during 1949 and 1950. The same Section 12 which directs the resumption of regular immigration from Austria and Germany also directs that for the next two years 50 percent of the German and Austrian quotas be used for persons of German ethnic origin who were born in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania or Yugoslavia and who on July 19, 1948 were residing in Germany or Austria.

This is a radical departure from previous American immigration laws. In nearly every other instance, a prospective immigrant to the United States must obtain a quota number from the quota of the country in which he was born regardless of his nationality present or past. Ordinarily, a person born in Czechoslovakia who has resided most of his life in Austria and who indeed possesses Austrian nationality must nevertheless travel to America under the Czech quota. Section 12 puts this provision of the Immigration Act of 1924 aside and for a period of two years permits ethnic Germans, more usually called Volksdeutsche, to travel to America under the German and Austrian quotas, even though they were not actually born in Germany or Austria.

As soon as the provisions of the Displaced Persons Bill were known, the Department of State directed that American consular offices in Germany and Austria make preparations to accept registration for immigration to the United States.² A date was established and kept secret upon which the announcement was to be made that residents of Germany and Austria could once again apply for a place on the waiting list of persons desiring to travel to America for permanent residence.

On Sept. 17, Mr. Marshall M. Vance, supervisory consul general for Germany, held a press conference in Frankfurt and made public the details of the new program. It was carefully announced that if a resident of Germany or Austria desired to apply for immigration, he must write a letter of request to the appropriate American consular office, enclosing in his letter a stamped self-addressed envelope in which a blank registration form could be returned to him.

In spite of these explicit instructions, thousands of would-be immigrants began to gather early on the morning of Monday, Sept. 20, before the doors

¹ Article prepared by James S. Sutterlin, U.S. Vice Consul, Frankfurt. This article is reprinted from the *Information Bulletin* of Nov. 2, 1948, of the U.S. Military Government in Germany.

² *BULLETIN* of Sept. 26, 1948, p. 411 and Oct. 17, 1948, p. 501.

THE RECORD OF THE WEEK

of the consulates in Germany and Austria. Interest in immigration proved intense, and during the first week approximately 150,000 written requests for registration forms were received in the six offices in Germany and the two offices in Austria. This was no surprise to consular officers, however, who providently had had 2,000,000 registration forms printed.

The question is often asked "What chance has one of the thousands of persons who have written in for registration forms to travel to the United States within the foreseeable future?" The answer is "That depends."

If he was not among the first to have returned his completed registration form, then he has a long wait, perhaps a matter of years. Approximately 25 percent of the several thousand mailed requests to the American Consulate in Stuttgart for registration forms are not being considered because they failed to conform with specified procedure. The commonest mistake has been failure to enclose with the request for registration a self-addressed, stamped envelope in which the registration form can be returned to the intending immigrant.

If a person submits an incorrect request he must then resubmit it in the proper manner. If he has no one willing to pay the cost of his transportation, he will have to wait until the time when the Deutsche mark can be used to purchase transportation; and if he cannot find someone who will be answerable for his support in the United States, or if he is seriously unsound either in body or mind, or if he has been or is a member of a movement hostile to the United States Government, he might as well give up any thought of immigration to the United States.

On the other hand, if he was among the first to return a completed registration form by mail to the appropriate consular office, if he has friends or relatives in the United States who are willing to vouch for his support and who are in addition willing to finance his journey, if he is sound in body and mind, and if he is not considered a security threat to the well-being of the United States and its people, his chances are good for beginning a new life in America.

U.S. Protests Hungarian Seizure of American Oil Interests

NOTE TO HUNGARIAN MINISTRY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS

[Released to the press December 2]

Text of a note delivered by the American Legation in Budapest to the Hungarian Ministry for Foreign Affairs under date of November 30, 1948, with reference to the Hungarian-American Oil Company (MAORT)

The Legation of the United States of America presents its compliments to the Hungarian Ministry for Foreign Affairs and has the honor to refer to Decree No. 9,960/1948 Korm.,¹ whereby the Hungarian Government has taken over the management, including the control of all assets and rights, of the Hungarian-American Oil Company (MAORT) and the MAORT Gas Trading Company, American-owned subsidiaries of the Standard Oil Company (New Jersey).

The Legation is authorized to inform the Ministry for Foreign Affairs that the Government of the United States, viewing this action of the Hungarian Government as wholly arbitrary and unwarrantable, (1) reserves all rights on its own behalf and on behalf of its nationals with respect to the status and property of MAORT and the latter's subsidiary the MAORT Gas Trading Company and (2) holds the Hungarian Government responsible for the continued operation of the afore-

said Companies and for the value of the assets of the Companies as of September 25, 1948, the date on which the Decree in question was published and came into force.

With reference further to the action of the Hungarian Government in this matter, the Government of the United States has taken note of the charges of "industrial sabotage" which the Hungarian Government has made against the owners and officials of MAORT and caused to be publicized in the "Report of the Hungarian Ministry of Home Affairs on the MAORT Sabotage" (Grey Book) as well as in the officially controlled Hungarian press. These charges are compounded of various assertions to the effect that the owners and officials increased oil production during the recent war, thus assuring significant support for the German war machine; that they decreased production after the war to hinder Hungary's economic development for political reasons and did this with the knowledge and under the direction of American Mission officials in Hungary; that they carried out this "sabotage" on the financial side by improper expenditures and management, against the Hungarian planned economy by disregarding instructions of the National Planning Office and by preventing the purchase of necessary equipment and the repair of machinery, on the technical side by

¹ Not here printed.

drilling exploratory wells at unpromising sites, hindering research, and improperly completing the wells, and, as regards the construction of the Lispe-Budapest natural gas pipeline, by placing every possible obstacle in the way of the project.

These allegations against the good faith and operations of the management of MAORT have been fully and conclusively refuted by the Standard Oil Company (New Jersey) in its memorandum entitled "Standard Oil Company (New Jersey) and Oil Production in Hungary by MAORT: 1931-1948," a copy of which is enclosed for the attention of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

The Legation is instructed to inform the Ministry for Foreign Affairs that the Government of the United States emphatically rejects as false and malicious in their entirety the charges of "sabotage" which the Hungarian authorities have made against the owners and officials of MAORT. Moreover, the United States Government regards these allegations as having been politically motivated to serve the purposes of Communist propaganda and to feign grounds for bringing the Companies under Communist State control. In attempting to develop its fraudulent case against MAORT, the Hungarian Government has played up as primary evidence the alleged "confessions" of Mr. Paul Ruedemann and Mr. George Bannantine, American officials of the Company. However, the facts in this connection attested by sworn statements made by the two men upon their release from Hungarian police custody, are now well-known.² The truth concerning these "confessions," which were so hastily publicized in the obviously prefabricated Hungarian "Grey Book" and elsewhere, is (1) that they were prepared by the Hungarian police, (2) that their contents are wholly false, and (3) that force and duress were employed against Mr. Ruedemann and Mr. Bannantine to compel them to copy in longhand and sign the documents. From these circumstances alone, the conclusion is also warranted that the "confessions" obtained by the Hungarian authorities from Dr. Simon Papp and other Hungarian employees of MAORT are likewise of a spurious character and were exacted by the usual police state methods.

The Government of the United States also deems it appropriate, relative to the principal accusation made by the Hungarian authorities against MAORT concerning the decreased rate of crude oil production, that the Legation should not only affirm the fact that MAORT consistently adhered to a policy of rational exploitation in the interest of conserving the oil resources of Hungary but should also draw attention to the fact that both the Secretariat of the Hungarian Supreme Economic Council and the experts of the Hungarian Ministry for Industry in the middle of 1947 recognized the necessity for reducing the rate of MAORT oil production. Thus, in a memorandum of the Ministry for Finance, dated July

8, 1947, which was presented as an item on the agenda of the Supreme Economic Council on July 9, it was reported that

"according to the recommendation of the secretariat of the Supreme Economic Council, oil production of 636,000 tons should be reduced by 10 percent, whereas the experts' opinion of the Ministry for Industry stated the necessity of reducing the production of 600,000 tons by 16 percent. A reduction by 16 percent is imperatively indicated by the status of the crude oil resources of Hungary."

It was further reported in the memorandum that

"if the production is not reduced by 16 percent, the following consequences will ensue:

"a.) 50 percent or 3,500,000 tons of the country's crude oil resources totalling 7,000,000 tons cannot be utilized.

"f.) During the course of the coming 3 years the output of oil is expected to decrease by more than the 16 percent reduction envisaged at present. Without the 16 percent reduction production will decrease more rapidly and will be reduced before long by 25 to 30 percent.

"Recommendation: On the above grounds it is absolutely indispensable to reduce the annual production of 600,000 tons by 16 percent."

Even more explicit than the foregoing was the original statement of the interdepartmental committee of experts that

"on the basis of gross production during the period during January 1 through May 31, 1947 (256,695 tons) the production during the course of 12 months amounts to 600,000 tons.

"In the opinion of the experts, if necessary investments are effected, the present level of production may be maintained; however, in this case an approximate quantity of 3,500,000 tons of the crude oil resources would remain in the earth and would be forever lost whereas with rational exploitation this quantity would be available. The above quantity is six times as much as the present annual production."

Finally, in the original report of the Secretariat of the Supreme Economic Council it is stated that

"in the opinion of the experts of the Ministry of Industry, in the interest of rational exploitation the gross production of 600,000 tons should be reduced by 16 percent, which means an annual gross production of 500,000 tons and an annual net production of 428,000 tons."

It is evident in the light of the essential facts set forth above—facts which are supplemented

² BULLETIN of Oct. 17, 1948, p. 494.

by many pertinent details in the Standard Oil Company's extended account of MAORT's operations—that the charges of "sabotage" brought by the Hungarian Government against the owners and officials of MAORT cannot be sustained, are therefore inadmissible, and cannot, as pretended by the Hungarian Government, serve as justification for that Government's action in taking over the management of the MAORT properties.

In these circumstances, the Government of the United States looks upon the Hungarian Govern-

ment's course and manner of proceeding in this matter as an encroachment upon American rights and interests in Hungary, for which the Hungarian Government must bear full legal and financial responsibility.

The Legation avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry the assurances of its most distinguished consideration.

Enclosure:

Copy of memorandum by Standard Oil Company (New Jersey) entitled "Standard Oil Company (New Jersey) and Oil Production in Hungary by MAORT: 1931-1948."*

Double Taxation Conventions With Denmark and the Netherlands Ratified

On December 1, 1948, Acting Secretary of State Lovett, the Ambassador of Denmark, Henrik de Kauffmann, and the Ambassador of the Netherlands, E. N. van Kleffens, in Washington, formally exchanged the instruments of ratification of the conventions with Denmark and the Netherlands for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income. The Netherlands convention was signed in Washington on May 6, 1948, and the one with Denmark on April 29, 1948.

Denmark

It is provided in the convention that upon the exchange of instruments of ratification the convention shall have effect (a) in the case of United States tax, for the taxable years beginning on or after the first day of January of the year in which such exchange takes place, and (b) in the case of Danish tax, for the taxable years beginning on or after the first day of April of the year in which such exchange takes place. Accordingly, upon its entry into force with the exchange of instruments of ratification, the convention became effective retroactively on and from January 1, 1948, with respect to United States taxes and retroactively on and from April 1, 1948, with respect to Danish taxes. These dates are fixed in conformity to the fiscal systems of the respective countries.

As specified in article I, the taxes to which the convention is made applicable are (a) in the case of the United States, the Federal income tax, including surtaxes, and (b) in the case of Denmark, the national income tax (including the war profits tax), the intercommunal income tax, and the communal income tax.

The purpose of the convention, like that of existing income-tax conventions of the United States with Canada, France, Sweden, and the United Kingdom, is the elimination, so far as practicable, of double taxation which otherwise would result from the imposition and collection of taxes upon

the same income. The convention also establishes certain procedures for the exchange of information and for administrative cooperation between the two countries in relation to taxation, with a view to the prevention of fiscal evasion. The convention contains provisions for the exemption in one or the other of the two countries of certain types of income. Likewise, the principle of the United States tax-credit system is adopted in the convention on a reciprocal basis.

A proclamation of the convention will be issued by the President. The English and Danish texts of the convention will be printed in the Treaties and Other International Acts Series published by the Department of State. Meanwhile, the English text may be found in Senate Executive H, 80th Congress, second session.

A United States reservation to the convention which rejected article XII was accepted by the Danish Government.

Netherlands

It is provided in the convention that it shall become effective on the first day of January in the year last preceding the year in which the exchange of instruments of ratification takes place. Accordingly, upon its entry into force with the exchange of instruments of ratification, the convention became effective retroactively on and from January 1, 1947.

As specified in article I, the taxes to which the convention is made applicable are (a) in the case of the United States, the Federal income taxes, and (b) in the case of the Netherlands, for the application of specified provisions, the income tax and the Netherlands taxes credited against it, the corporation tax and the Netherlands taxes credited against it, the property tax, the tax on fees of directors and managers of corporations, the capital accretions tax, and the extraordinary capital tax.

The purpose of the convention, like that of existing income-tax conventions of the United States with Canada, France, Sweden, and the

* Not printed.

(Continued on page 746)

Cooperative Exchange Programs Under the Smith-Mundt Act

BY WILLIAM C. JOHNSTONE, JR.¹

If our essential freedoms are to prevail, if other peoples are to have the opportunity to enjoy their fruits, we in America must act more effectively to increase the knowledge of our principles and of the institutions founded on them among other peoples. And we must act more effectively to provide greater opportunities for people from other nations to come here and see for themselves. Only when ideas and knowledge are exchanged across national boundaries—only when peoples of different nations meet face to face and become acquainted with each other can international understanding be developed as a foundation for peace.

These facts of international life have long been recognized. Now, however, we are confronted with the fact that national boundaries are increasingly becoming barriers to exchange of ideas and knowledge. More and more people are barred from understanding America's intentions and experiencing our freedoms. We can no longer afford to observe passively the rapidly shrinking area of freedom throughout the world. We must actively combat the forces that would chain men's minds by dogmas. Our attack demands the concerted effort of all groups in our society—both citizen and government.

Fortunately, the American people are taking positive action.² Now for the first time in our history we are engaged in a comprehensive, cooperative program on a world-wide scale with the objective of building mutual understanding among peoples. This program was clearly and boldly laid down in the Smith-Mundt Act, passed by Congress in January 1948. This law authorized the Department of State in cooperation with private agencies, to undertake an information and educational exchange program throughout the world designed to tell the story of American life and institutions by means of press, radio, and motion pictures, and to provide for the two-way exchange of persons and materials in the educational, cultural, scientific, and technical fields. It is this latter program with which I am directly associated—the educational exchange program—which I should like to discuss with you for the next few minutes, for I believe that a quick look at the current and planned activities in this field will serve to underline the increased responsibilities which will naturally accrue to higher education as well as government.

As of today we are operating 64 United States Libraries abroad, and it is anticipated that by the end of the current fiscal year we will have 83 libraries in 52 countries. These are small libraries designed to provide for the people of other countries a cross section of all aspects of American life through selected books, pamphlets, and other materials. Located in the principal cities all over the world, they are free and open to anyone who wants to know about the United States. American staff members are ready to answer all sorts of questions—and believe me they do! Teachers come into these libraries and are able to get accurate information for presentation in their classrooms. Professors come to read American professional journals to find out what their colleagues in the United States are doing. Scientists come to acquaint themselves with the latest developments in the United States. There is not a single library in which some of the regular visitors are not government officials of the country in which the library is located. They find valuable experience in all of the developments of American government which often gives them a clue to some problems with which they are immediately concerned.

And so they come in all walks of life—often with very simple questions—a dairy farmer wants to subscribe to an American dairy farming magazine; an exporter wants to know about advertising in American periodicals; a dentist wants to know how he can purchase American dental equipment. But these questions—simple as they are—illustrate a great desire to use American know-how and very often lead to an interest in many other aspects of American life. Our overseas officers utilize this interest by arranging for film showings, exhibits, concerts, and lectures in the libraries. Thus the natural interest of people abroad about all things American is gradually turned into a better understanding of American ways and institutions.

Ten years ago in Latin America we began to give aid to a new kind of institution—new at least, in American relations with foreign countries. As

¹ Address made before the Regional Conference on Higher Education, National Education Association, in New York City on Dec. 3, 1948, and released to the press on the same date.

² For additional information on the program see *Cooperation in the Americas* (Department of State publication 2971), and *International Education Exchange* (Department of State publication 3312).

part of the Good Neighbor Policy, we have assisted local cultural institutes founded by the joint efforts of resident Americans and nationals of the country who have dedicated themselves to sponsoring programs of cultural interchange toward the end of creating improved understanding among peoples of the Western Hemisphere. Today there are 28 of these cultural institutes in the Latin American countries. They have attracted people in all walks of life to their English teaching classes and to their exhibits, lectures, music, and other activities. I should like to cite an example which I feel is typical of the impact of this activity.

Recently an eminent Brazilian engineer came to this country for the first time, under a State Department grant, for a three months' tour of the country. He was primarily interested in agricultural developments in Brazil. For a number of years he has been president of our cultural center in São Paulo, and his interest in and knowledge of the United States is quite extensive. Before he left this country he was asked what was the outstanding thing he found. His answer would amaze the average American, for he named our rural free delivery service. It was his contention that this service provided by our Government was not only a means of educating a people, a means by which they could keep in contact with their friends, but also an evidence of our democracy. He was surprised to find that farmers in outlying rural regions were able to receive their mail in open, unlocked mail boxes. He is taking back that idea to his country.

In Latin American countries American-sponsored schools have been established. At first they were started to provide an American education for the children of American residents, private and public officials in the country. Gradually, they were opened to the children of the people of the country itself. We have provided aid in various forms to these schools and in each country they stand as an example of American education. In one country, for example, the whole educational system is undergoing a revision because of the advanced methods and techniques used in the American school. Under the Smith-Mundt Act, we propose to extend this aid to schools and American-sponsored educational institutions throughout the world.

By far the largest effort, however, is being put into interchange of persons between the United States and other countries. Here again we have been carrying on a program in Latin America for ten years. During World War II, the State Department was authorized to carry on this program with China and with certain countries of the Near and Middle East. Therefore, we have a considerable experience now when we propose to extend this program to the whole world. This is the kind of a program in which cooperation of government and private organizations is particularly essential

to its success. It involves two types of exchanges—interchange of scientific and technical personnel between the United States and other countries and interchange of teachers, scholars, and students. In carrying out its responsibilities in exchange of scientific and technical personnel, the State Department works through an Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation composed of representatives of the other federal agencies. This program provides for the exchange of scientific and technical personnel, the detail of American governmental experts from many of our government agencies in Washington to other countries to assist them in a variety of specialized problems. It involves the training of government officials from other countries and bringing younger persons here to be trained in a particular specialty to go back to their own countries to put into practice the results of their American experience. Let me cite some examples.

Several years ago there was an outbreak of poliomyelitis in Ecuador. The Ecuadoran Government asked the United States to send an orthopedic surgeon to work with their public-health administration there and a technician from our Children's Bureau in the United States to follow up this orthopedic surgeon in organizing hospital techniques for getting the children suffering from this disease back on their feet. After this children's specialist had been seen on the streets of the capital for a number of months, her work was reported in the newspapers. She was approached one day by a taxi driver, who doffed his hat and said: "Señorita, my fellow taxi drivers want to tell you how grateful we are for the work you are doing for the children of my country. They asked me to tell you that if any time of day or night you need a taxi, they are at your service". Appreciation comes in strange unexpected ways, but it is no less important because of this.

Incidentally, this Children's Bureau specialist stayed on to reorganize the national school of social service in Ecuador and trained most of the faculty. Only last June the school graduated its first class of 17 specialists, most of whom will go to work for the Ecuadoran Government to attack the problem of poliomyelitis.

A number of years ago El Salvador requested our assistance in developing her agriculture, of which coffee is the principal commodity. Our scientists, under a mutual agreement with the Salvadoran Government, set up an agricultural experiment and demonstration station in 1942. One of the results of its work was the development of a dairy feed from the waste pulp of the coffee bean. When mixed with banana leaves and other products to make it palatable, the cattle will eat it, and it serves as a substitute for a large percentage of corn in their balanced ration. The result of this discovery is that we have added a dairy feed to the hemisphere equal in quantity, the De-

partment of Agriculture estimates, to 34 million bushels of corn yearly. This is important to the economy of all coffee-producing countries, and internationally noteworthy in view of the world-wide shortage of corn and other feed grain.

The way in which the various agencies of our government are brought to bear on a specific problem is well illustrated by the preparations made for the 1950 census of the Americas. This census represents the first systematic survey of its kind and promises to yield important results. The Bureau of the Census of the Department of Commerce, with assistance from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture, the National Office of Vital Statistics of the Federal Security Agency, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, has developed a coordinated program for giving technical assistance to officials and agencies in the Latin American countries for taking the censuses of population, agriculture, industry, business, and mining.

In the integration of census work it is strengthening the statistical staff of the governments of the countries concerned. To implement this program American Government agencies have sent one or more consultants to each of the other American republics. More than 100 technicians from other American republics have been awarded grants to come to the United States and work with our government agencies for advanced study and training. Many of these have returned to their own countries and now hold responsible posts in this field in their countries. Special trainees have been sent at the expense of their own government, and by 1950 more than 200 men and women in the other American republics will have received special census training.

It is in the field of academic exchanges that the cooperative nature of our educational exchange program becomes most apparent. In this program private institutions in the United States, the State Department, foreign governments and private institutions in foreign countries join in a cooperative undertaking which has as its purpose the exchange of ideas and knowledge and the creation of a better understanding of the United States by peoples abroad and of a better understanding of other countries by Americans.

This whole program of academic exchanges has been further stimulated by the existence of the Fulbright Act under which proceeds from the sale of American surplus property abroad in foreign currencies are earmarked under an agreement between the United States and the country concerned for educational purposes. Twenty-four countries are eligible to participate under this act. We have signed agreements with eight and four programs are now in operation. We expect that twenty countries will have program operations going by the end of this fiscal year. Because of

the existence of the Fulbright Act and foreign currency funds available in these twenty countries for purposes of academic exchanges, it will enable us to plan not a one-year program but a two-, three- or four-year program of exchanges. However, academic exchanges will not be confined to the countries participating in the Fulbright program. The new authorization under the Smith-Mundt Act provides for carrying out on a world-wide basis the exchange program which has been limited for the past ten years to the Western Hemisphere.

I do not think it necessary to justify the value of exchange of students, teachers, and scholars to this distinguished audience. The immediate results as well as the long-term effects are plainly evident. Let me cite two examples.

Two years ago we were asked if we could facilitate the visit of a young doctor from Iraq to this country for purposes of medical research. It was possible to arrange a two-year grant for thirty-year old Dr. Suad Niazi, and he was awarded a tuition fellowship at the University of Minnesota to do research toward the doctor of philosophy degree in medicine. A little over a month ago, at the October meeting of the Clinical Congress of the American College of Surgeons in Los Angeles, Dr. Niazi announced the discovery of a test for cancer which may by early diagnosis save thousands of lives. This test has proved 90 percent accurate in diagnosing 62 varieties of cancer. Because he is here on a two-year grant, he will have the opportunity to conduct further research in this most vital problem in medicine, and it is his hope that he can find much more of value in the attack on the disease of cancer. The small investment which was made in his study in the United States both by the government and by a private university has been justified a hundred times by the discovery which this brilliant young doctor has made.

Two and one half years ago, the State Department assisted in the development of an idea of exchange of teachers between Great Britain and the United States at the primary and secondary level. This was an official undertaking on behalf of the British and American Governments in which assistance of private organizations was gladly given in a cooperative undertaking which involved not only private organizations but our public school systems in forty of the forty-eight states. This is the third year of an exchange of teachers program administered by the United States Office of Education at the request of the State Department. More than a hundred American teachers have taught in Great Britain and a hundred English teachers have taught in the schools of the United States. The results of this are often startling.

A woman teacher, for instance, from the schools of Oklahoma City was assigned to teach in a slum district in the industrial town of Leeds, in Eng-

land. It may have been a discouraging prospect to the woman who had been used to the fine physical equipment of the Oklahoma City Schools. However, she was not discouraged and because she represented America as well as her school, it was not long before the city of Leeds and Oklahoma City began to get acquainted. As a result of her efforts school children in both cities began exchanging letters and teachers began exchanging ideas. Again, as a result of the visit of an English teacher to a small town in Texas, 1,700 Texas school teachers and 1,700 British teachers have now begun a steady correspondence with the exchange of ideas, materials, and books. Such exchanges can only result in a far better understanding of each others' problems in the countries concerned.

I believe that one of the unique features of this Government's undertaking is its cooperative aspect. The basic legislation authorizing this program enjoins the State Department to utilize the facilities, the services, and the advice of private agencies and institutions throughout the country. But it goes still further. It provides for two advisory commissions—one to advise on our information policy abroad and the other to advise on our educational exchange policies and programs. These two commissions, appointed by the President and composed of distinguished private citizens who serve without pay, not only recommend and advise to the Secretary of State quarterly on the conduct of these world-wide programs, but are required to report twice yearly to the Congress on what the State Department has done to put into effect their recommendations. By the establishment of these commissions the public interest is officially recognized in the conduct of foreign relations in an entirely new way. The keen interest already evident on the part of members of the commissions is a healthy sign. It is heartening assurance that this unique approach is a step toward making representative government even more representative.

I have described some of the educational exchange activities of the State Department and the proposed plans to expand these activities to new areas under terms of the Smith-Mundt Act. I hope that you have not gained the erroneous impression that the role of government is an exclusive or dominating one. Nothing could be further from the truth. The act itself not only defines the limits of governmental participating but specifically urges that fullest use be made of private facilities. In fact, the act is so devised as to permit the government to encourage and assist private agencies and institutions to expand rather than diminish their activities. Those directly responsible for conduct of the program affirm this policy. Mr. George V. Allen, Assistant Secretary of State for public affairs, recently re-

affirmed the opinion that "government's role should remain supplemental . . . and that it should be limited to those fields where private industry cannot or does not wish to enter." The support of a wide variety of private agencies and institutions as well as the support of the public generally is vital to the success of this undertaking. Your Government needs—your Government welcomes this support.

Fellowships for Research and Study in Other Americas Available

[Released to the press November 30]

Opportunities for a limited number of American graduate students to obtain fellowships from the United States Government for study or research in the other American republics were announced on November 30 by the Department of State and the United States Office of Education.

The two programs under which these grants-in-aid are offered are:

1. *The travel and maintenance grant program.* These grants are supplementary in nature and awarded to students who have obtained grants-in-aid, veteran benefits, scholarships, fellowships, or travel grants from private organizations and institutions, or who have limited funds of their own. Grants cover a minimum period of six months to a maximum of one year and may be renewed when desirable and necessary to the completion of work begun, provided funds are available for such extension. The amounts of the awards will vary with the individual needs of the students and the cost of living in the country in which study is to be undertaken. Applicants should write to the Division of International Educational Relations, American Republics Branch, United States Office of Education, Washington 25, D.C. The final date for receipt of applications for these fellowships is March 15, 1949. Selections will be made in April 1949, and notification of awards will be made as soon as possible thereafter.

2. *Fellowships for United States graduate students under the Buenos Aires convention.* Under this program, two graduate students are exchanged each year between the United States and each of the republics signatory to the convention. This year the following countries have indicated that they will receive students from the United States: Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, Venezuela. Transportation to and from the host country is paid by the United States Government. The host government pays tuition and a monthly allowance. Grants are for one year of study or research. Applicants should write to

Department of State Bulletin

the Division of International Educational Relations, American Republics Branch, United States Office of Education, Washington 25, D.C. The final date for receipt of applications is January 1, 1949.

Qualifications: In order to apply students should have the following qualifications for either program: United States citizenship, a B.A. or its equivalent, the initiation or completion of some graduate study, a satisfactory knowledge of the language of the host country, good health, moral character, intellectual ability, and a suitable plan of study or research approved by his supervisor or adviser. All other considerations being equal, students under 35 years of age and veterans will be given preference.

Mineral-Geologic Survey Program With Brazil Extended

[Released to the press November 30]

The Department of State announced on November 30 that a cooperative mineralogical-geological survey program between the Governments of Brazil and the United States has been extended for a ten-year period.

The American Embassy at Rio de Janeiro informed the Department that the program, originally established in 1940, was extended by agreement between the Embassy and the Brazilian Foreign Office on November 26, 1948.

The general purposes of the cooperative program are as follows:

- (a) to appraise the mineral resources of Brazil, both as regards those which now constitute a part of the trade between the United States of America and Brazil as well as those which may in the future enter into this trade;
- (b) to prepare geologic, topographic, and other maps which may be used as a scientific basis for the development of Brazil's mineral resources;
- (c) to encourage the exchange of scientific knowledge and techniques between the two countries, particularly as regards aerial geologic mapping, topographic mapping, economic geology, and ground water and mineralogical investigations;
- (d) to make technological investigations as to the industrial use of Brazilian mineral ores, both for internal consumption as well as for purposes of export trade;
- (e) to study the problems connected with prospecting, research, mining, processing, and combustion of Brazilian coals.

The new agreement is to remain in effect for a period of ten years from the date of its entry into force—that is, ten years from November 26, 1948. It may be terminated by either of the Governments

on 60 days' written notice. The implementation of the agreement will be carried forward by the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior on behalf of the Government of the United States of America and by the Departamento Nacional da Produção Mineral of the Ministry of Agriculture of the Government of the United States of Brazil. Salaries and expenses of personnel of the respective agencies will be paid by the agencies. Transportation costs of U.S. personnel in Brazil will be defrayed by the Government of Brazil.

Diplomatic Relations Between U.S. and Peru Continued

[Released to the press November 21]

The United States Government has decided to continue normal diplomatic relations with Peru. It has therefore instructed the American Ambassador in Peru, Harold H. Tittmann, Jr., to reply to a note dated October 31 addressed to him by the new Peruvian Government.

This decision is in line with resolution no. 35 adopted at the Bogotá conference early this year. This resolution states that continuity in diplomatic relations is desirable and that the establishment, maintenance, or renewal of diplomatic relations with a particular government does not in any way imply any judgment as to the domestic policy of such a government.

The note received by Ambassador Tittmann states that the new Government of Peru will scrupulously observe that country's international obligations. It also expresses a hope that the traditional cordial relations between our two countries will continue. Our note in reply expresses satisfaction over these statements made by the Government of Peru.

President of Cuba Visits United States

President Carlos Prío of Cuba arrived in Washington on December 8 for a visit in the United States. President Prío was honored at a dinner given by President Truman at the Blair House, and during his stay in Washington visited points of interest in the surrounding area. The members of the Council of the Organization of American States entertained him at a special luncheon meeting on December 9 and the Acting Secretary of State gave a dinner for him on the same evening. On December 10 a luncheon was given by the National Press Club and following a visit to the Naval Academy at Annapolis, the Ambassador of Cuba and Señora de Belt held a reception in honor of the Cuban President. Mr. Belt was scheduled to depart from Washington on December 11 for New York and to leave for Habana the following day.

Mexican Zoologist Visits United States

José Alvarez del Villar, professor of zoology at the National School of Sciences, National Polytechnic Institute, Mexico, D.F., recently arrived in Washington as the recipient of a grant-in-aid under the travel-grant program of the Department of State in cooperation with the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior. After a short visit in Washington, he will go to La Jolla, California, for approximately two months of research at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, where he will collaborate with Dr. Carl L. Hubbs in completing for publication a monograph on the fresh-water fishes of northeastern Mexico. His itinerary will also include Chicago, Urbana, and New York. He will remain in the United States until the end of February 1949.

U.S. and Canada Agree on 1948 Program for Canadian Potato Crop

Through an exchange of notes completed on November 23, 1948, the United States and Canada entered into an agreement whereby the Canadian Government will institute a price-support and export-permit program for the 1948 Canadian potato crop. Under this program there will be no further exports of table-stock potatoes to the United States and the program will be designed to channel exports of certified seed potatoes into seed outlets only in the United States. The agreement was reached following a series of conferences between Canadian officials and officials of the United States Departments of State, Agriculture, and Treasury (including the Customs Bureau).

Restriction of export of seed potatoes will be accomplished by the Canadian Government through an export-permit system. The export permits for seed potatoes will be issued to Canadian shippers on a time-schedule basis, designed to direct shipment of Canadian certified seed potatoes into those states where there has been a traditional demand for certified seed potatoes for actual use for seed, and only during a short period immediately preceding the normal planting date. Before obtaining such permits Canadian exporters will be required to prove that they have firm orders from *bona fide* users of Canadian seed potatoes in the United States and that their sales contracts contain a clause restraining the buyers from diverting to other destinations or uses.

In connection with the institution of such a program by Canada, the United States indicates that it will not hereafter impose any quantitative limitations or fees on the 1948 crop of Canadian potatoes.

In Canada's prompt and effective cooperation with the United States in this matter another in-

stance has been provided of the readiness of the two countries to take joint action to meet problems of mutual concern. Canada, in entering into this agreement, has assisted the United States materially by recognizing the adverse effect which unrestricted imports of Canadian potatoes would have on the United States potato programs.

For text of the exchange of notes, see Department of State press release 954 of November 26, 1948.

U.S. Invited To Convene a Conference for Negotiating International Wheat Agreement

[Released to the press December 3]

Charles F. Wilson, Chairman of the Preparatory Committee appointed by the Governments of the countries which signed the International Wheat Agreement last March, announced that the Committee met in Washington on December 3 and agreed to invite the Government of the United States to convene a conference in Washington on January 25, 1949, for the purpose of negotiating an International Wheat Agreement.

The countries represented on the Preparatory Committee are Australia, Benelux (Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg), Brazil, Canada, Egypt, France, India, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Proclamations Relating to Migratory Bird Treaty Act

The President has issued the following proclamations: Closed Area Under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, Massachusetts, on October 18, 1948; Modification of Closed Area Under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, Oregon, on October 20, 1948; and Amendment of Regulations Relating to Migratory Birds and Game Mammals on October 30, 1948, and on November 5, 1948. For texts of these proclamations see 13 *Federal Register* 6115, 6191, 6465, and 6549 respectively.

Letters of Credence

New Zealand

Sir Carl Berendsen, K.C.M.G., presented his credentials to the President as Ambassador of New Zealand on December 1. For texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release 967 of December 1, 1948. Since July 12, 1944, Sir Carl had served as Minister to the United States.

Department of State Bulletin

Ratifications of Chinese Commercial Treaty Exchanged

[Released to the press November 30]

Ratifications of the treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States and China were exchanged at Nanking on November 30. Under its own provisions, the treaty became effective on the day on which the ratifications were exchanged.

This treaty was signed at Nanking on November 4, 1946, ratified by the Chinese Government on November 11, 1946, and agreed to by the United States Senate on June 2, 1948.

This is the first comprehensive commercial treaty to be concluded by either Government since the war. The United States and China signed their first treaty of peace, amity, and commerce in 1844. The present treaty is basically similar to treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation now in force between the United States and various other countries. It is believed to offer an adequate basis for the development of cultural, business, and trade relations to the mutual advantage of the two countries. The treaty contains articles relating to rights of individuals and cor-

porations; exchange of goods; navigation; and general matters.

Under its own provisions the treaty will remain in effect for five years from the day it comes into force, and will remain in force thereafter subject to termination on one year's notice by either government.

Madame Chiang Kai-shek Arrives in U.S.

A United States naval transport plane was made available to Madame Chiang Kai-shek at her request for transportation for her and a small party to Washington in connection with the critical situation in China. Madame Chiang departed from Shanghai on November 28 and arrived in Washington on December 1.

Change in Name of the Netherlands East Indies

Effective September 20, 1948, the Netherlands East Indies (Netherlands Indies) is to be known as Indonesia. The change in nomenclature is embodied in the revision of the constitution of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

Caribbean Commission Releases Two Technical Studies

The Industrial Development of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands of the United States

A publication entitled *Industrial Development of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands of the United States* dated July 1948 is now available. The report contains chapters on the following subjects: background of Puerto Rican economy; national income; balance of payments; exports and imports; fiscal structure of the Puerto Rican Government; Government influence on industry; manpower, wages, hours, and working conditions; sources of fuel and power; transportation and communications; sources of materials; growth of production; expansion of existing industries; new enterprises; capital for industrial development.

The Sugar Trade of the Caribbean

The first of a series of bulletins on external trade of the Caribbean, *The Sugar Trade of the Caribbean*, was released on November 13 by the Caribbean Commission.

According to the Commission's release, the major conclusions which emerge from the statistics presented for the trade in sugar and its by-products during the years 1935-1945 may be summarized as follows:

Despite the war, exports of sugar had increased by 1945 as compared with 1935 by one tenth in volume and by two fifths in value. At the height of the war, in 1942, exports declined by 3 percent in volume and, in 1940, were 6 percent below the 1935 figure in value. The French Islands were a notable exception to this rule, while, at the other extreme, the increase was steady and virtually uninterrupted in Barbados and Jamaica.

Largely as a result of the war, exports of rum increased considerably. By 1944 they had doubled in quantity and were five and a half times as much in value. The increase was nothing short of phenomenal in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Barbados, Trinidad, and Tobago.

Exports of molasses experienced a considerable decline. They reached their lowest point in 1943, when they were only one fifth in volume and one third in value as compared with the exports for 1935.

The total value of exports of sugar and by-products increased by more than one half during the period under review.

The increase of exports of rum effected a considerable change in the relative importance of sugar and rum in the total exports of sugar and by-products. From one fourteenth of the total

THE FOREIGN SERVICE

exports of sugar and by-products in 1935, exports of rum increased to one quarter in 1943 and three tenths in 1944. Exports of sugar, more than four fifths of the total exports of sugar and by-products in 1935, declined to two thirds in 1944.

The comparative increase in export prices of raw sugar, 27 percent by 1945, was over-shadowed by the comparative increase in import prices of refined sugar, 164 percent by 1945.

With the restriction of imports during the war, refining of sugar was developed to a considerable extent, not only to meet local needs but also to supply the needs of the nonsugar-producing Caribbean territories. The increase was particularly noticeable in the case of Barbados and Jamaica, whereas in Puerto Rico substantial quantities of refined sugar have regularly been exported.

An interesting sidelight on the rum trade is the considerable exchange that takes place between the sugar-producing areas. However, the market for Jamaica rum is, in the most literal sense of the phrase, the world market.

These two publications may be procured from the Secretary General, Caribbean Commission, Kent House, Port-of-Spain, Trinidad, B.W.I., for \$1.50 and \$1.00 respectively.

Double Taxation—Continued from page 738

United Kingdom, is the elimination, so far as practicable, of double taxation which otherwise would result from the imposition and collection of taxes upon the same income. The convention also establishes certain procedures for the exchange of information between the two countries in relation to taxation with a view to the prevention of fiscal evasion. Through liberal and reciprocal use of the method of eliminating double taxation through exemption at source, the convention with the Netherlands conforms closely to the pattern of the income-tax convention between the United States and the United Kingdom. Likewise, the principle of the United States tax-credit system is adopted in the convention on a reciprocal basis.

The convention contains special provisions representing a unilateral concession on the part of the Netherlands, relating to the Netherlands capital-accretions tax and Netherlands extraordinary-capital tax and granting substantial benefits to American citizens and certain other persons who were formerly Netherlands residents.

A proclamation of the convention will be issued by the President. The English and Dutch texts of the convention will be printed in the Treaties and Other International Acts Series published by the Department of State. Meanwhile, the English

* For texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release 938 of Nov. 23, 1948.

text may be found in Senate Executive I, 80th Congress, second session.

The convention was ratified by the United States subject to three reservations, which were accepted by the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands and which read as follows:

1. The Government of the United States of America does not accept article XI of the convention relating to gains from the sale or exchange of capital assets.

2. The Government of the United States of America does not accept article XIII of the convention relating to United States taxation of the undistributed earnings, profits, income, or surplus of a Netherlands corporation.

3. The Government of the United States of America does not accept article XIV of the convention relating to settlement of unpaid United States income-tax liability unless there be eliminated therefrom (a) references now appearing therein to article XIII and (b) any language which might prevent the taxation by the United States of capital gains, if any, taxable under the revenue laws of the United States for the respective years in which such gains were realized.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE

U.S. and Afghanistan Raise Diplomatic Missions to Embassy Status

Afghan Ambassador Presents Credentials¹

[Released to the press November 24]

The Afghan Legation in Washington was elevated to Embassy status on November 23, when the Ambassador Sardar Mohamed Naim Khan presented his letters of credence to the President.

The Government of Afghanistan indicated its willingness to exchange Ambassadors on March 18, 1948, and our mission in Kabul became an Embassy, with Ely E. Palmer as the first Ambassador of the United States on June 5.

Diplomatic relations between the two countries were established on May 4, 1935, when the first American Minister presented his credentials to the King of Afghanistan. The first Afghan Minister to the United States was received by the President on June 4, 1943.

Consular Offices

The American Consulate at Cochabamba, Bolivia, was closed to the public on October 29, 1948.

The American Vice Consulate at La Guaira, Venezuela, was closed to the public on November 22, 1948. The vice consular district for La Guaira has been assigned to Caracas. A Consular Agent assumed charge at La Guaira.

Department of State Bulletin

PUBLICATIONS

Department of State

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

International Telecommunication Conferences. Atlantic City, New Jersey, May-October 1947. International Organization and Conference Series I, 4. Pub. 3177. 192 pp. 40¢.

Report of the United States Delegations to the International Radio Conference, the International Telecommunication Conference, and the International Conference on High Frequency Broadcasting, with selected documents.

80th Congress and the United Nations. International Organization and Conference Series III, 17. Pub. 3302. 66 pp. 35¢.

An itemized discussion, with pertinent appendixes, of all legislation regarding the United Nations considered and passed during the two sessions of the 80th Congress.

Settlement of Pecuniary Claims Against Yugoslavia. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 1803. Pub. 3307. 9 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Yugoslavia, and Accompanying Aide-Mémoire and Notes—Signed at Washington July 19, 1948; entered into force July 19, 1948.

Diplomatic List, November 1948. Pub. 3342. 198 pp. 30¢ a copy; \$3.25 a year domestic, \$4.50 a year foreign.

Monthly list of foreign diplomatic representatives in Washington, with their addresses.

Current United Nations Documents: A Selected Bibliography¹

Security Council

Official Records, Third Year:

- No. 101, 344th meeting: 4 August 1948. 27 pp. printed. 25¢.
- No. 102, 345th and 346th meetings: 10th August 1948. 41 pp. printed. 40¢.
- No. 103, 347th meeting: 12 August 1948; 348th and 349th meetings: 13 August 1948. 46 pp. printed. 50¢.
- No. 104, 350th meeting: 16 August 1948. 19 pp. printed. 20¢.
- No. 107, 353rd, 354th and 355th meetings: 19 August 1948. 56 pp. printed. 60¢.
- No. 108, 356th meeting: 30 August 1948. 11 pp. printed. 10¢.
- Supplement for August 1948. 167 pp. printed. \$1.65.

Economic and Social Council

Official Records: Third Year, Seventh Session. Supplement No. 6. Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Genocide. 5 April to 10 May 1948. E/794. 19 pp. printed. 20¢.

Trusteeship Council

Resolutions Adopted by the Trusteeship Council during its Third Session from 16 June to 5 August 1948. 7 pp. printed. 10¢. T/215.

Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian Administration. Report - Annex IV: Petitions. T/217/Add.1, 31 October 1948. 82 pp. mimeo.

¹ Printed materials may be secured in the United States from the International Documents Service, Columbia University Press, 2960 Broadway, New York City. Other materials (mimeographed, or processed documents) may be consulted at certain designated libraries in the United States.

Contents

The United Nations and Specialized Agencies

	Page
Proposal To Establish Committee To Study Berlin Currency Problem:	
Text of Proposal of President of the Security Council	719
Text of Three-Power Reply	719
Tripartite Communiqué to Committee of Experts	720
Resolutions on the Special Committee on the Balkans:	
Conventions and Refugees	722
Greek Children	722
Discussion of Israeli Application for Membership. Statement by Philip C. Jessup .	723
Resolution Establishing Conciliation Commission for Palestine	726
The U.S. in the U.N.	728
U.N. Documents: A Selected Bibliography .	747

General Policy

U.S. Protests Hungarian Seizure of American Oil Interests. Note to Hungarian Ministry for Foreign Affairs	736
Diplomatic Relations Between U.S. and Peru Continued	743
President of Cuba Visits United States . .	743
Letters of Credence: New Zealand	744
Madame Chiang Kai-shek Arrives in U.S. .	745
Change in Name of the Netherlands East Indies	745
U.S. and Afghanistan Raise Diplomatic Missions to Embassy Status	746

Treaty Information

International Joint Commission Hearings on Pollution of Boundary Waters	732
Double Taxation Conventions With Denmark and the Netherlands Ratified . .	738
Mineral-Geologic Survey Program With Brazil Extended	743

Treaty Information—Continued

	Page
U.S. and Canada Agree on 1948 Program for Canadian Potato Crop	744
U.S. Invited To Convene a Conference for Negotiating International Wheat Agreement.	744
Proclamations Relating to Migratory Bird Treaty Act	744
Ratifications of Chinese Commercial Treaty Exchanged	745

Economic Affairs

Eighth World's Poultry Congress. Article by W. D. Termohlen	731
Third North American Regional Broadcasting Conference Scheduled	732

International Information and Cultural Affairs

Cooperative Exchange Programs Under the Smith-Mundt Act. Address by William C. Johnstone, Jr.	739
Fellowships for Research and Study in Other Americas Available	742
Mexican Zoologist Visits United States . .	744

Occupation Matters

Views on Soviet Action Prior to Berlin Election. Exchange of Letters Between Marshal Sokolovsky and General Clay .	734
German and Austrian Immigration Opened to the United States	735

The Foreign Service

Consular Offices	746
----------------------------	-----

Publications

Caribbean Commission Releases Two Technical Studies	745
Department of State	747

Contributors

W. D. Termohlen, author of the article on the Eighth World's Poultry Congress, is Director of the Poultry Branch of the Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture, and was Chairman of the United States Delegation to the Congress.